

gress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to U.S. policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DULSKI (for himself, Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. NIX, Mr. POOL, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. WHITE, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. BRASCO):

H. Con. Res. 705. Concurrent resolution to assist veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have served in Vietnam or elsewhere in obtaining suitable employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H. Con. Res. 706. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 707. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that the level of U.S. forces should not be increased in Vietnam without the explicit consent of the Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY (for himself, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. GUBSER, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. REES, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. TUNNEY, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. ROTH, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, Mr. RAILSBACK, Mr. SCHWENGLER, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. COWGER, and Mr. SNYDER):

H. Con. Res. 708. Concurrent resolution requiring appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to U.S. policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H. Con. Res. 709. Concurrent resolution to provide for the affirmation of the right to self-determination and freedom of the peoples of subjugated nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H. Con. Res. 710. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. KYROS, Mr. BATES, Mr. CONTE, Mr. ESCH, Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, Mr. RUPPE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. RIEGLE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FRASER, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. BATTIN, Mr. CAHILL, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. SANDMAN, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. FARBSTEIN, Mr. GILBERT, and Mr. GOODELL):

H. Con. Res. 711. Concurrent resolution requiring appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to U.S. policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WHALLEY, Mr. BROCK, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BUSH, Mr. PRICE of Texas, Mr. WAMPLER, Mr. ADAMS, and Mrs. MAY):

H. Con. Res. 712. Concurrent resolution requiring appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to U.S. policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Con. Res. 713. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the tax-exempt status of interest on industrial development bonds should not be removed by administrative action; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 1102. Resolution to urge the President to release the highway trust funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII.

320. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Federal participation in aid to families with dependent children which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 16032. A bill for the relief of Allison Jean Fernandes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 16033. A bill for the relief of Anna Liguori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 16034. A bill for the relief of Vladimir Vujic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 16035. A bill for the relief of Dr. Triponia Artienida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 16036. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Rutigliano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 16037. A bill for the relief of Caroline G. Junghans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 16038. A bill for the relief of Francesco Guglieri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 16039. A bill for the relief of B. J. Carney & Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 16040. A bill for the relief of B. J. Carney & Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 16041. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Cameretti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H.R. 16042. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Gershon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 16043. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maximina Garabiles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

263. By the Speaker: Petition of the city of Millvale, Calif., relative to formulation of a policy of peace in Vietnam and an orderly withdrawal from the present untenable position of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

264. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., relative to a war profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—Monday, March 18, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of grace and God of glory, trusting only in Thy mercy would we seek Thy face. Grant us the grace to keep our hearts with diligence, knowing that out of them are the issues of life.

In these days of tension and crisis, as we gird the might of the Nation, and that of our allies, to defend threatened liberties, may we take care to strengthen the spiritual foundations of our democracy, knowing that without these verities we but build on sinking sand.

As today's discords bombard our ears, we are grateful for friendships which stand all tests, for music which gives

wings to our spirits, for truth which breaks the shackles of error, and for human beacons of righteousness where Thou dost show sufficient of Thy light for us in the dark to rise by.

Give us, O God, the strength to build
The city that hath stood
Too long a dream, whose laws are love,
Whose ways are brotherhood;
And where the sun that shineth is
God's grace for human good.

We ask it in the name of Him who is the light and the truth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 15, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under the VIII, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,
The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.
(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in the event that a request should be made to clear the floor of all unauthorized personnel during the consideration of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Tom Korologos, an employee of the office of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], be granted the privilege of the floor unless specifically excluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Roads of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 989. An act to provide improved judicial machinery for the selection of Federal juries, and for other purposes;

H.R. 536. An act to convey certain Chillico Indian School lands at Chillico, Okla., to the Cherokee Nation;

H.R. 14743. An act to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for United States notes and Treasury notes of 1890; and

S.J. Res. 138. Joint resolution calling on the Boy Scouts of America to serve the youth of this Nation as required by their congressional charter.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, reporting, pursuant to law, that the amount of Export-Import Bank insurance and guarantees issued in January 1968 in connection with U.S. exports to Yugoslavia and Rumania totaled \$3,698 and \$2,547, respectively; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need for change in method of computing the cost of power sold for commercial purposes in the Missouri River Basin Project, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior dated March 18, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines at Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1967; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering all employee claims of the Department in the fiscal year 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States dated March 7, 1968, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 3178. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 3179. A bill for the relief of See Ting Lip Lee (Stan Lee); and

S. 3180. A bill for the relief of Gim Hum Loy (Jim Louie); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 3181. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mete V. Altug; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON, by request):

S. 3182. A bill to authorize the purchase, sale, exchange, mortgage, and long-term leasing of land by the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 3183. A bill for the relief of Dr. G. Sri Rama Gupta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 3184. A bill relating to the appointment of U.S. marshals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 3182—INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE PURCHASE, SALE, EXCHANGE, MORTGAGE, AND LONG-TERM LEASING OF LAND BY THE SWINOMISH INDIAN TRIBAL COMMUNITY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], a bill to authorize the purchase, sale, exchange, mortgage, and long-term leasing of land by the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community, and for other purposes.

This bill is introduced at the request of the Swinomish Indian Senate and the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community.

The purpose of the legislation is to grant the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community new authority for the management and development of the land resources of the Swinomish Reservation.

Mr. Tandy Wilbur, business manager of the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community, and Mr. Dewey Mitchell, chairman of the Swinomish Indian Senate, have informed me that it is necessary to broaden the economic base of the tribal community. One source of increasing income is through the development and leasing of tribal property, particularly tribal tidelands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3182) to authorize the purchase, sale, exchange, mortgage, and long-term leasing of land by the Swinomish Indian Tribal Community, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 3184—INTRODUCTION OF BILL RELATING TO APPOINTMENT OF U.S. MARSHALS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last session I introduced S. 1277 which was referred to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This bill would have upgraded the deputy U.S. marshals and provided for the appointment of U.S. marshals by the Attorney General. Since the introduction of this bill the Justice Department has taken administrative action which substantially improved the conditions of employment for the deputy

marshals. However, there is still a need for change in the appointment procedure for U.S. marshals. The bill which I am now introducing will provide that change.

The U.S. marshal is an officer of the Justice Department and performs highly responsible and extremely hazardous tasks associated with the enforcement of Federal laws throughout the country. He serves civil and criminal processes, makes arrests, and performs other major legal functions all closely aligned with the Attorney General and supervised and directed by him. This bill recognizes this relationship and provides for the appointment of the U.S. marshal by the Attorney General who would utilize civil service criteria in making his appointment.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill be appropriately referred and that the bill be printed in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the *RECORD*.

The bill (S. 3184) relating to the appointment of U.S. marshals, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

S. 3184

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 561 (a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Attorney General shall appoint a United States marshal for each judicial district."

(b) Section 561(b) of such title is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 565 of such title is hereby repealed.

(d) The sectional analysis at the beginning of chapter 37 of such title is amended by changing

"565. Vacancies."

to read

"565. Repealed."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 24(b) of the Organic Act of Guam as amended (64 Stat. 390; 48 U.S.C. 1424b(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a United States attorney for Guam to whose office the provisions of chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code shall apply."

(b) Section 24 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (d) as follows:

"(d) The Attorney General shall appoint a United States marshal for Guam to whose office the provisions of chapter 37 of title 28, United States Code, shall apply."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 45(a) of title 3 of the Canal Zone Code is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Attorney General shall appoint a United States marshal for the district of the Canal Zone to whose office the provisions of chapter 37 of title 28, United States Code, shall apply, except as otherwise provided in this Code."

(b) Section 45(b) of such title is hereby repealed.

(c) Section 45(e) of such title is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The appointment and tenure of deputies and clerical assistants of the United States marshal are subject to section 562 of title 28, United States Code."

(d) The caption of section 45 of such title is amended to read:

"§ 45. Appointment, leave, and residence of United States marshal; deputies and assistants."

(e) The sectional analysis at the beginning of subchapter II of chapter 1 of such title is amended by changing title 45 to read:

"45. Appointment, leave, and residence of United States marshal; deputies and assistants."

SEC. 4. A United States marshal serving under a Presidential appointment on the date of enactment of this Act shall be covered into the competitive service under title 5, United States Code, upon passing such suitable noncompetitive examination as the Civil Service Commission may prescribe.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTROY] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 3015) to provide for a coordinated national safety program to reduce boating accidents, and deaths and injuries resulting therefrom.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2613) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that farming losses incurred by persons who are not bona fide farmers may not be used to offset nonfarm income.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2934) to assist the States in raising revenues by making more uniform the incidence and rate of tax imposed by States on the severance of minerals.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STANDARDS OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EM- PLOYEES OF THE SENATE— AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 616

Mr. CANNON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the resolution (S. Res. 266) to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 617

Mr. MILLER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate Resolution 266, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 618 THROUGH 621

Mr. ALLOTT submitted four amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate Resolution 266, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 622

Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. CLARK) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate Resolution 266, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 623

Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. CASE, Mr. SPONG, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. HATFIELD) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate Resolution 266, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 624

Mr. CLARK submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate Resolution 266, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954, TO ALLOW A CREDIT AGAINST INCOME TAX TO INDIVIDUALS FOR CERTAIN EXPENSES INCURRED IN PROVIDING HIGHER EDUCATION—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 625

Mr. HARTKE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 835) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

EXCISE TAX RATES—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 626 THROUGH 628

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware submitted three amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 15414) to continue the existing excise tax rates on communication services and on automobiles, and to apply more generally the provisions relating to payments of estimated tax by corporations, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** announced that on today, March 18, 1968, the President pro tempore signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 14743) to eliminate the reserve requirements for Federal Reserve notes and for U.S. notes and Treasury notes of 1890, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF OTTO KERNER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 26, 1968, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Otto Kerner, of Illinois, to be U.S. circuit judge, seventh circuit, vice, Win G. Knoch, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], chairman, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON INTEREST RATE CEILINGS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, on Friday, March 29, the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions will hold hearings on S. 3133, a bill to extend for 2 additional years the authority of the appropriate supervisory agencies to regulate the maximum rate of interest paid on time and savings deposits. On that same day, the subcommittee will also hold hearings on S. 2923, a bill to extend for 2 years the authority of the Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury.

On Monday, April 1 and Tuesday, April 2, the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions will hold hearings on S. 3001, a bill which requires the appropriate supervisory agencies to issue regulations on security measures.

On Wednesday, April 3, the subcommittee will hold hearings on S. 2959, a bill to increase insurance of savings and loan accounts and bank deposits of public units.

All of the preceding hearings will take place in room 5302 of the New Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m.

Persons wishing to testify on any of the above bills should contact Mr. Kenneth McLean, professional staff member, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5306, New Senate Office Building.

TWO-PRICE SYSTEM ON GOLD

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, over the weekend I noticed that monetary authorities of a number of nations, cooperating with the United States, met and agreed to what is called a two-price system on gold. I am personally happy to see this arrangement, based on the press accounts I have seen up to this point. It is the kind of arrangement which I have suggested makes good sense as a first step in meeting the crises facing a great number of nations with regard to the gold problem.

In my opinion, if it had been made clear that the major trading nations of this world have no interest in buying any more gold for monetary purposes or for other purposes, those who venture in the gold hoarding business and those who have undertaken to make a run on the gold supply of the United States and other trading nations would find that their speculation was a bad mistake and they would stand to lose their money.

I think that those who wish to speculate in that fashion should take a risk. Our policy with respect to buying and selling should be such that those who buy great amounts of gold in excess of their needs, to store it under the mattress or to bury it in the ground, should face the prospect of very heavy losses. I would prefer to see the price go far below \$35 an ounce. When the United

States and other trading nations take the attitude they have enough gold for the purposes in mind, and have no interest in buying any more, it would seem to me that we could look forward to the day when the price would come down to less than \$35 an ounce.

I favor a program where the United States no longer buys gold at \$35 an ounce so that speculators would take the risk that gold is not worth speculating in as a commodity.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When it comes to trading with friendly nations, or nations which are joined with us in a cooperative undertaking, it might be desirable if we were to say that we recognize \$35 an ounce as the price of gold already on hand.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I would like to comment briefly on the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana with regard to the gold situation.

I was happy to see that in the agreement reached over the weekend these seven central bank heads agreed definitely that there would be no purchase of gold at any price by any of the central banks. They also agreed that if any central bank, either among them or outside, sold any of its monetary gold in the free market, that bank would be cut off to any future access to gold held by these seven central banks.

As far as its effect on our free market economy is concerned, our American gold miners will now get the benefit of any increase in the price of gold. They will be permitted to sell gold abroad at the higher price if there is any gold sold abroad. But when they sell gold inside the United States, they are subject to the same regulations that were in existence before the agreement was entered into. They can only sell gold into distributing points certified by the Federal Government, and the prohibition against the holding of gold by an American citizen is still in effect.

The world's use of gold in the arts, in industry, and in the dental profession is much less than the amount of gold the speculators have forced into the free market.

It seems to me that the speculators can only continue to sell gold to each other or they can sell it for these commercial and artistic uses and with a lack of ultimate market equal to the amount of free gold in the world now, the free price of gold must fall. How long it would take to get below \$35 an ounce I do not know, but I would think there is a very good chance it could go below \$35.

What we have done is to buy time in which the trading nations of the free world can reorganize their method of settling their international balances, and we have also drastically cooled off the

great excitement. We have not done any damage to the purchasing power of the dollar inside the United States. We have moved to maintain accessibility of the dollar in exchange for other foreign currencies.

I hope the problem will simmer down and that we can get to other long-range plans.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator has said. I personally voted against the roll back of the gold cover because I wanted as much pressure as possible on this Nation to start doing the kind of thing that was done by this agreement. It seems to me this is a very constructive step toward a solution of the problem.

Mr. BENNETT. If we had not rolled back the gold cover, this step could never have been taken.

The final vote last week was one of the most interesting votes we have cast. It was good that the vote was close, but it would have been tragic if it had gone the other way.

Mr. President, I would like to add one little footnote. I think we must remember that, as a result of the agreement reached over the weekend on gold, we are very definitely now in the hands of our friends. We are dependent on their good nature and their good will to maintain this agreement.

I have a feeling that this agreement was not easily reached, and that they must have attached some conditions and assurances. It is pretty obvious to guess that one of those conditions was the requirement that we put our domestic fiscal house in order. I think we are a little shortsighted if we look only to the balance-of-payments problem, because that, in part at least, is the result of our internal domestic deficits. The speed with which the administration has begun to move since the weekend to try to get the tax bill through, and the fact that the administration is beginning to talk, now, about reduction in expenses, would indicate to me that we are seeing a classic example of the way that gold can exert a disciplinary effect on a government. I think if we ignore the warning signals, and our friends should decide to withdraw their support of us and withdraw from the agreement made yesterday, we would really be in serious trouble.

I believe we are committed to these foreign countries, these foreign central bankers, on whom the international strength of the dollar depends, to do for us what we should have done internally a long time ago. So, to that extent, we are no longer the masters of our own destiny as far as taxes and expense reductions are concerned.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] in saying that I am pleased we were able to reach this agreement over the weekend with the central banks of Europe.

I agree with the Senator's statement that this action is merely buying time, not only for the central banks to work out a better plan, but also buying time in our country to put our financial house in order.

We should not lose sight of the fact

that this crisis was brought about largely as the result of the loss of confidence in the British pound and the American dollar, and this loss of confidence in the dollar has developed from our inability over the last several years to balance our national budget and thereby put our financial house in order, we must come closer to living within our income.

We cannot afford expansion of all of these domestic programs in the midst of a full-scale war.

Last week's agreement in Washington only lends emphasis to the fact that there must be congressional action at an early date on the two major steps that need be taken before we get to the heart of the problem. The first step is a real reduction in expenditures. The second step is that expenditure reductions must be accompanied by increased taxes. We in Congress and in the executive have no choice except to face up to these problems and take these hard but necessary steps. The sooner it is done the better it would be both domestically and internationally.

I strongly recommend even now, as important as is the measure now pending before the Senate dealing with ethics, that the leadership lay this measure aside and bring up the tax bill and make it the pending business. Certainly we should proceed to write into law a realistic reduction in expenditures; and then second, face up to the question of increasing taxes. If we did that, it would mean that both at home and abroad confidence in our dollar could be restored. This action should be taken before the weekend. The administration, as I understand their position will now go along with reduction of expenditures in return for the tax increase.

There is no reason in the world why the executive and legislative branches working together cannot agree on such a program. The earlier the better. Time is very important right now.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the comments of my distinguished colleagues about the threatened collapse of the international monetary system. What was done over the weekend was truly a palliative. This is not to imply that the action taken was unwise. Some action was necessary. It can be only of a temporary nature, however, and only temporarily effective. For a two-price system of gold exchange in the international field is tantamount to putting one's money in two pockets, one good pocket and one with a hole in it. To expect the assets of each pocket to remain on a par would be as realistic as to expect the palliative action to be more than a temporary purchase of time during which, as the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has said, the United States will have some time to make necessary and advisable accommodation to the international threat.

I cannot concur, however, in what seemed to be the purport of the remarks of the senior Senator from Delaware, that an increase in taxation is the most important part of the necessary action. The distinguished Senator said that the crisis in gold was brought on by loss of confidence in the U.S. dollar.

What caused that?

The loss of confidence in the U.S. dollar abroad springs from a loss of confidence in the quality of American leadership in world affairs as well as at home.

Let us make no mistake about it; the deficit at home is not so important to the confidence of the U.S. dollar as the continuing deficit of our imbalance in international payments. Even that is not so important in shaking the confidence of the world in the quality of U.S. leadership as is the unwise, the dangerous, and the seeming blindness of this country's plunging further and further into the war in Southeast Asia.

Thus, Mr. President, in order to restore confidence in the U.S. dollar, there must be a regaining of confidence in U.S. leadership both at home and abroad.

I stand prepared, as I have been prepared, to vote for a tax increase. Indeed, I opposed the big tax reductions of recent years as well as investment tax credit as being a very unwise step in the direction of our present plight.

I stand ready to increase Government revenue now and to make reductions in expenditures. I so voted in the Finance Committee last week but I stand ready, too, to urge and do now urge the President to seek the earliest possible settlement of the Vietnamese war. That is what is most disturbing of all to the confidence in U.S. leadership which has manifested itself in the loss of confidence in the value of the U.S. dollar.

GOLD OUTFLOW—ANOTHER ARGUMENT AGAINST SURTAX

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the gold crisis makes it imperative that Congress not pass the administration's surtax. The surtax would weaken our balance-of-payments position. It would aggravate the gold outflow.

Consider that on February 6, 1964, the then Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, told the House Ways and Means Committee that the tax reduction recommended that year by President Johnson would help our balance of payments.

He said it would do so by making American investment more attractive relative to European investment, and help stop the flow of American capital and U.S. gold abroad.

Dillon was right. In the 2 years following the 1964 tax reduction, America's balance of payments did improve.

The tax cut directly reduced the burden of taxes on American corporate profits. Increased profits attracted investment, and helped stem the outflow of dollars.

But the administration's proposed 1968 tax increase would do exactly the reverse.

It would immediately cut the profits of American corporations by a highly significant 10 percent. This would surely discourage investment in American corporations. And it would just as surely increase the flow of dollars and gold abroad.

Yet the Treasury is trying to have it both ways. The 1964 tax cut was justified in part on the grounds that it would help solve America's adverse balance of payments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Assuming that the tax increase is to achieve its objective; namely, to bring more revenue to the Government, it would mean that for business to maintain the same level of profits they would have to increase their prices because there is no other way it could be done; is that not correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana is absolutely correct; or business will suffer a sharp, clear, and immediate reduction in profits on business so that it will have to increase its prices. In either event, the effect on our balance of payments would be adverse from the imposition of the surtax.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the tax is greater, we must maintain the same level of business and the same gross profits in order to increase the tax revenues. If the tax increase goes into effect, the pressure will be on business to find a way to maintain the same level of profits after taxes that they had prior to the new tax. And the only way they can do it is to raise prices.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Raise prices.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Now, when they raise prices, that makes American commodities less attractive abroad, because the price is higher and they are, therefore, less competitive. So that not only would investment here be less attractive; but, the necessary corollary would be that the cost of the goods would have to go up and make our balance of payments more unfavorable.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It would increase our imports and decrease our exports.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The 1968 tax increase is incredibly justified on the same grounds. The Treasury can logically argue that the 1964 tax cut helped our balance of payments and reduced our gold outflow. In fact, it did.

It did this by reducing the taxes on American corporations and enhancing their attraction for foreign and domestic capital.

But it cannot then logically pivot around and argue that a 1968 increase in taxes which reduces the profitability of American corporations will bring dollars and gold back to this country. Obviously the surtax will hurt—not help—our dollar and gold position.

The contention that the tax increase will slow down the economy and stem inflation is not relevant to the 1968 gold stampede.

It will take more than a year for the tax increase to have any favorable effect on inflation. Past experience shows that the surtax, in reducing taxpayers' incomes, will not reduce their spending significantly for some time, and prices also respond slowly to the fall in demand.

Furthermore, the surtax is unlikely to increase our trade balance for two reasons, as the Senator from Louisiana has said so well:

First, the tax is a cost which will tend to increase the price of our exports and reduce their competitiveness.

Second, few, if any, of the major commodities sold abroad by the United States are likely to fall in price as a result of reduced domestic demand.

Food is not going to fall in price. Neither are our great farm exports or automobiles going to fall in price. An examination of the great exports of the United States makes it clear that they do not respond in price to moderate changes in demand.

Finally, in the one area of our entire balance-of-payments picture where a surtax might make a minor positive contribution by reducing imports, a reduction in Federal spending would accomplish the same result more swiftly and incisively.

There may be other arguments for a tax increase at this time, but the balance of payments and gold crisis is clearly not one of them.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have been listening to all that has been said today and last week about our balance of payments. It is my belief that the reason why we have lost so much gold is that we have tried to assist everybody in the world. As the Presiding Officer knows, we have had five or six divisions in Western Europe for quite some time at a cost to us of about \$2 billion per year. This money is spent by our soldiers and their dependents in Western Europe, and needless to say this permits the Western European countries to accumulate our dollars in great quantities. Of course, these dollars eventually become claims against our gold when they are not used to buy our goods.

Mr. President, I do not want to say this boastfully, but I think the RECORD will show that I was the first Senator to get up on this floor and call to the attention of the Nation how we were losing our gold, and I tried to stem the flow in the late fifties. As I recall, it was in 1959 when I spoke at length on the subject in an effort to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1959, and I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from speeches I made on the floor of the Senate on July 7, 1959, and on September 12, 1959, be inserted in the RECORD at this point. I also ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point excerpts from my 1960 report on U.S. foreign operations, Senate Document No. 20 of the 87th Congress, which were also included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the date of February 13, 1961.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 10, pp. 12800-12807]

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1959

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, about two-thirds of the authorization in the pending bill for military assistance would be allocated to NATO Europe, which includes Greece and Turkey, as well as most of the countries of Western Europe. I am opposed to further grants for these countries, because that area of the world is presently enjoying unparalleled economic prosperity. I propose to document this statement in a later portion of my address.

If the nations of Western Europe had accepted the original purpose of the Marshall plan, they would now be helping us in our endeavor to develop the backward nations of the world. But this is not happening. West-

ern Europe still has its hand out, and is looking for more aid.

I cannot accept the premise that foreign aid must be continued because the United States is an endless repository of wealth, and I believe the facts support my position.

As I said on Thursday, last year, for the first time since the War Between the States, the United States had a deficit in its balance of payments. What is more, we are fast losing our gold reserves to the very people who still are receiving our aid, our dollars.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to read an article which was published in the London Observer on June 7 of this year, as follows:

"[From the London (England) Observer, June 7, 1959]

"DOLLAR ON DEFENSIVE

"(By Alan Day)

"A great deal too much play has been made recently with the idea of the weakness of the dollar.

"Obviously, there is a strong temptation for us in Britain to take pleasure when sterling's international rival is under pressure while sterling is standing very well in world esteem. But it would be wise to restrain any tendency to chortle at our friends' misfortunes; if they were really to become serious, the effects on us would be very unpleasant.

"Fortunately, there is no reason to think that the dollar is at present under any real pressure. Naturally, one is a little suspicious when the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury makes a solemn declaration that the dollar will not be devalued—the whole thing is too reminiscent of sterling in 1949. But sometimes such statements should be taken at their face value—and this is such an occasion.

"Good creditor

"As far as the flows of payments into and out of the United States are concerned, the current position is one which we should all regard as encouraging. America is playing the role of a good creditor which we have so long demanded of her, by lending abroad and making grants to poor countries. At the same time, she is importing on an immense scale—because she provides the most prosperous and one of the most wide-open markets in the world.

"A great deal is heard of American tariffs and import restrictions, but the fact is that her policies are remarkably liberal. Many of her tariffs, particularly on industrial goods are low by the standards of the advanced industrial countries—as an example, cars pay 10 percent going into the United States compared with about 20 percent in Germany and 30 percent in France and Britain.

"Losing reserves

"The average incidence of the American tariff on all foreign goods is almost certainly not appreciably higher, and may be substantially lower, than that of the United Kingdom. And protection of American manufacturing industry by quotas is so rare as to make headline news—whereas we and other European countries still protect many sensitive industries in this way, even though there are no longer any real balance-of-payments reasons for doing it.

"Even so, it can be argued, America is losing reserves and cannot go on doing so forever. At the latest count, her gold reserves were only slightly above the \$20 billion mark, and if recent rates of decline continue, they will fall below that level within a few weeks.

"A luxury

"Of this total something like \$12 billion of America's gold reserves are tied, in that they are required by law as 'backing' for the internal currency circulation. This requirement is a luxury that Britain has long foregone, and in 1945 the American authorities found no difficulty in reducing the required backing from 40 percent to 25 percent of the

currency circulation. Compulsory gold backing for a currency is, in fact, a primitive survival; the value of money derives not from its gold content but from its acceptability and depends on its being sufficiently scarce not to lose its value.

"All the same, even if the American legal reserve is regarded as a sacrosanct, the United States still has enough free reserves to pay out 60 percent of her overseas short-term liabilities. This compares very favorably with Britain, who would use up the whole of her gold reserve if she has to pay out only 33 percent of her sterling liabilities.

"Three choices

"The fact remains, however, that America cannot allow an indefinite decline in the ratio between her reserves and short-term liabilities—which would happen if her present balance-of-payments deficit were to continue indefinitely. If she chose to deal with the problem by reducing this deficit, various steps would be open to her.

"She could cut her aid to other countries—and certainly it is arguable that the \$1 billion which went in 1958 to Western Europe (other than Greece and Turkey) is not particularly justifiable. She could cut imports; a really illiberal policy would do the rest of the world much harm. And in the last analysis she could devalue.

"That, however, is such a remote contingency that it should not be taken seriously—except insofar as one should bear in mind that a dollar devaluation in terms of gold would almost certainly entail an equivalent sterling devaluation. When our average payments surplus is still well below the \$350-£400 million annual rate which we need for safety, any upward valuation of sterling in relation to any major currency would be very dangerous. And as the National Institute of Economic and Social Research recently pointed out, the evidence of recent years is that both American and British prices of manufactured exports have risen relatively to other countries' prices. Sterling and the dollar must hang together; we cannot hope to let the dollar hang separately.

"The worrying thing, however, is that the time may be coming when the world's dependence on the dollar and sterling as international currencies may put them both under real strain. Professor Robert Triffin, in an article in the latest issue of the Quarterly Review of the Banca Nazionale del Lavoro, has argued convincingly that the world's normal need for increased supplies of international currency over the next decade are likely to exceed current gold production by \$5 to \$15 billion.

"Risk of strains

"To close this gap by further extension of the use of dollars or sterling as ways of holding reserves would dangerously lower the ratio of Britain's and America's reserves to their short-term liabilities. He sees the 50 percent expansion of the quotas of the International Monetary Fund as a movement in the right direction, but far more comprehensive measures are needed if a return to a widespread system of controls is to be avoided.

"The most promising line of approach he sees lies in a true 'internationalisation' of the world's foreign currency reserves. This would remove the risk of strains on centre countries such as America and Britain, arising from the international use of their national currencies, which develop when there is speculation against dollars or sterling. In a truly international system, there would be a single international currency, so that arbitrary shifts between gold, dollars and sterling would not take place.

"From experience

"Triffin's own detailed solution will be developed in the next issue of the Review; but the line of thought that will deal with the problems he sees is clear enough. This

is for the artificial creation of a truly international currency which would be perfectly substitutable for gold. Such a movement in this direction of artificially creating currency which is acceptable throughout the world economy is simply an application on the international scale of the monetary developments of the last century on the national scale, through the development of central banking and paper money. And in the fact that it builds on past experience lies much of the attractiveness of this next step in the movement toward a sophisticated international currency system."

Mr. President, the RECORD will show that last year I attempted to reduce the \$1 billion which went to Western Europe in 1958 which the author of the article says was not justifiable.

Mr. President, in the pending amendment, I am merely asking that the \$1.6 billion proposed to be authorized for military assistance be cut by \$550 million.

The truth of the matter, Mr. President, is that we can no longer afford the present foreign aid program—if, indeed, we ever could have afforded it.

I think it is high time for us to look to our own financial stability. If we continue this program, we shall, I fear, spend ourselves into the poorhouse, and become a second-rate nation.

The effect of my amendment would be to reduce the amount authorized for military assistance by \$550 million. That would reduce the sum for that purpose from \$1.6 billion to \$1,050 million.

In my judgment, this would be the ideal place to begin making reductions in this bill.

Of the total of \$1.6 billion for military assistance in the committee's amendment, at first blush it would seem that this amount would be divided as follows: NATO Europe, \$1.1 billion; Near East, Africa, Southeast Asia, and the Far East, \$403.5 million; Latin America, \$96.5 million.

The European amount, I wish to point out, is an increase of \$223 million over the original administration request of \$777 million. The latter sum includes, in addition to direct military hardware gifts, such items as NATO infrastructure, mutual weapons development, facilities assistance, and so forth, all of which are nothing more than military aid to our NATO allies.

It should further be pointed out that the Foreign Relations Committee has recommended an increase, by a somewhat devious route, in the amount of military aid money for Western Europe of \$223 million. The total amount in the bill for military aid has not been increased. On the contrary, the administration estimate has been maintained; but the extra quarter billion dollars for Europe would be provided by taking proposed military aid from other areas and shifting it to Western Europe. I shall have more to say about this subsequently.

The committee has also done some fancy juggling with proposed military aid to Latin America. The original budget estimate was \$96.5 million for this purpose, the same amount as has allegedly been earmarked for that purpose in the pending bill.

However, only \$65 million need be spent for actual military aid to Latin America. The remaining \$31.5 million is neither fish nor fowl. The committee states that it is to be used, first, to establish a military force under the authority of the Organization of American States.

Frankly, Mr. President, I have some grave doubts about the wisdom of providing such a large amount to create a supranational police force, under the auspices of an agency whose voting power we do not control, and for use in an area where political instability has been the rule, rather than the exception, particularly during recent months.

We may well be on the way to creating a

military Frankenstein monster. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, it seems extremely likely that this supranational police force may never come into being. But the committee has taken care of that alternative, too. It has provided that in the event no such super-duper army is created, the \$31.5 million must be used for economic grant aid.

The committee amendment contains some other little gadgets, designed to deceive and confuse, which when taken together, convince me that the application of the term "military aid" to the \$1.6 billion amount in the bill under that category is really more fiction than fact.

First, the President—listen to this—has the authority to transfer up to 30 percent of the military aid money authorized in the pending bill to economic grant aid, in other words, economic assistance gifts. This means that the military aid amount can be reduced by up to \$480 million, and transferred over to economic assistance. In effect, nearly a half billion dollars of so-called military aid money is available for outright economic aid; and that partly forms the basis of my argument that the amount for this purpose should be reduced from \$1.6 billion to \$1,050 million.

Second, \$10 million of the military assistance fund is specifically earmarked for financing the education within the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands of citizens of underdeveloped countries. This means that another \$10 million of so-called military assistance must really be used for educational exchange.

I would also like to emphasize that this \$10 million authority is not a one-shot proposition. On the contrary, the bill provides that \$10 million per year, for the next 5 years, must be taken from funds provided for military assistance to be used for this educational exchange.

Mr. ELLENDER. Taken together, Mr. President, a total of \$521.5 million of the \$1.6 billion authorized for military assistance should more properly be categorized as economic aid.

Roughly, \$1.1 billion of the military aid authority is actually "hard core" military assistance.

Furthermore, the gadgets and doodads provided by the committee as a means of permitting the use of military aid for nonmilitary purposes further dilute the power and control of the Congress over the foreign aid program. It grieves me, Mr. President, to note that not only does this measure propose the further depletion of our Nation's economic resources, but it also contemplates an inexcusable depletion of the authority of Congress over the entire program.

Earlier in this discussion, Mr. President, I referred to NATO Europe, which is in line to receive \$1.1 billion in military aid, if the committee amendment is approved.

I believe that by now Senators are well aware of my views on military aid to NATO. I have stated on many occasions that our Western European allies, whom we have nursed back to economic health, are well able to stand on their own feet, and it is high time they began carrying a greater portion of their own defense burden.

My arguments in the past have gone unheeded. In my opinion, the Senate has succumbed to emotionalism and on many occasions to juggled figures offered by the executive branch.

The time has come, however, for Senators to lay aside the cloak of deception in which military aid to Europe has been wrapped and come to grips with the very basic realities of the economic facts of life in the NATO area.

I propose to demonstrate to Senators that our so-called European allies are not only asleep at the switch insofar as their own defense is concerned, but that they are actually

exploiting the generosity of the United States and our desire to preserve freedom against the onslaught of communism and using these factors as a means of increasing their own economic resources—increasing their economic competition with the United States, and, I fear, driving us toward the day when our own great Nation will be reduced to the status of a second rate power, both economically and militarily.

Congress is told year in and year out that the NATO countries must be aided because NATO supplies us with both a retaliatory force and a shield which are both absolutely essential to their security as well as our own.

Granted that this is correct, are we not justified in asking ourselves the question: Are our allies, who are well able to help us share the burden of protecting the free world, actually contributing their fair share to the joint venture of obtaining security for the free world? I believe a careful study and analysis will reveal they are not.

To answer the charge that our allies are not making a fair contribution to the mutual security of the free world, during the past few years, the proponents of a bigger and better military assistance program have employed the most contorted type of statistical gymnastics to convince the Congress and the taxpayers of this country that our allies are really contributing more than their share.

Graphic charts, employing gaudy colors, have been presented to the Senate Appropriations Committee, showing that our allies in Western Europe and those in the NATO bloc have spent \$6 for every dollar contributed by the United States. The statisticians, par excellence, then contend that this is visible proof of the great burden being carried by our allies.

For the uninitiated or for those who simply desire to close their eyes to reality, this so-called ratio of 6 to 1 has great appeal. But let us see of what it is composed.

The statistical gymnasts in developing this ratio combine the total defense expenditures of these countries—in some cases this total may include the amounts spent by the countries for their civil police force—and then compare the total with the amount which we contribute to assist them. They do not consider the total amount spent by the United States. To me this statistical presentation is purely and simply a case of deception, and lends credence to the old adage "that figures do not lie but liars figure."

Let us look at statistics which are fair—data which do not compare apples with oranges—but which compare apples with apples.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield to the Senator, on the Senator's own time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. Is the Senator making the point that he thinks the committee members are liars in presenting the bill to the Senate?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I did not say that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the significance of the remark?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am talking about the people who have furnished this information and juggled the figures for the past 5 or 6 years.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The committee members are not liars, but the administration representatives who furnished the figures are liars?

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume so. The Senator can take it as he wants to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to be clear on what the Senator means.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator can take it as he wants to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I want to understand what the Senator means.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator is willing to listen to a parade of the same persons who come before his committee year after year and, for example, make the statement

that we spend \$1 to our allies' \$6 for the protection of Western Europe, and he does not look any further, I think there is fault to be found. I have been trying to correct this situation for the past 5 or 6 years. I am sorry to say I seem to have completely failed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator understands, of course, I am not yielding on my time for the Senator to make another speech.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yielded for the question. I simply wanted to learn if the Senator was calling the committee members liars, or whom the Senator was calling a liar.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will read my speech in the RECORD tomorrow he will see to whom I was referring.

I hold in my hand a table showing the comparative resources which the United States and a number of European countries are expending for their own defense—exhibit E. This table demonstrates that the United States is devoting over 10 percent of its gross national product to defense, compared with less than 8 percent for the United Kingdom, less than 7 percent for France, less than 4 percent for Italy, 3.4 percent for Western Germany, 3.4 percent for Belgium-Luxembourg, and less than 3 percent for Denmark.

In other words, Mr. President, the United States, in many instances, is devoting in excess of three times as much of its gross national product to its defense and the defense of the free world, as some of the very nations to whom we are giving military hardware and other defense aid.

My staff has also developed some statistics which indicate what would happen if our so-called allies devoted the same percentage of their gross national product to defense as is used for that purpose by us—exhibit E. These data show that if this were done the following increases could be made in the defense budgets of the countries I have referred to: Britain, \$1.6 billion; France, \$1.8 billion; Canada, \$1.4 billion; Italy, \$1.6 billion; Western Germany, \$3.5 billion.

Taken together, Mr. President, if the NATO countries, including West Germany, were to earmark 10 percent of their gross national product for defense expenditures, an additional \$12,540 million would be available for the defense of Western Europe.

If this were done, Uncle Sam could certainly reduce his gifts to these countries. However, if U.S. aid were continued at projected levels, and if our NATO allies devoted 10 percent of their gross national product to defense, the United States would still be spending \$2 for every \$1 spent by our generous and unselfish allies for their own defense.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table I have referred to—exhibit E—be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"EXHIBIT E

"SUMMARY OF ACTUAL DEFENSE COSTS OF NATO COUNTRIES AND PROJECTION OF DEFENSE COSTS FOR THESE COUNTRIES BASED ON 10 PERCENT OF GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

"(Dollar amounts in millions)

| | Actual defense costs | Per cent of GNP ¹ | Defense costs based on 10 percent of GNP | Difference |
|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------------------|--|------------|
| Britain..... | \$4,800 | 7.5 | \$6,400 | \$1,600 |
| France..... | 3,800 | 6.8 | 5,590 | 1,790 |
| Canada..... | 1,800 | 5.6 | 3,200 | 1,400 |
| Greece..... | 155 | 5.3 | 300 | 145 |
| Netherlands..... | 460 | 4.9 | 940 | 480 |
| Turkey..... | 510 | 4.2 | 1,200 | 690 |
| Italy..... | 1,000 | 3.8 | 2,600 | 1,600 |
| Norway..... | 145 | 3.7 | 400 | 255 |
| West Germany..... | 1,800 | 3.4 | 5,300 | 3,500 |
| Belgium-Luxembourg..... | 380 | 3.4 | 1,100 | 720 |
| Denmark..... | 140 | 2.8 | 500 | 360 |
| Total..... | \$14,990 | | \$27,530 | 12,540 |

¹ Data supplied by ICA.

² U.S. cost totals \$45,489,000,000 or 10.4 percent of its gross national product. United States spends \$3.03 for every dollar spent by allies shown in above table.

³ Even if allied countries shown above would spend 10 percent of their gross national product the United States would still be spending almost \$2 for every \$1 spent by these countries."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have advanced this very same argument in the past and I have been confronted by a collective throwing up of hands by Members of the Senate, and representatives of the executive branch. "Oh," they chorus, "this would ruin the economies of these poor countries. To require them to spend as much percentage-wise as our own country for their own defense would impose intolerable burdens on their struggling economies."

Well, let us say that is so.

I have in my hand a table entitled "Consumption and Investments Expressed as Percentage of Available Resources" for a few selected European countries—exhibit F. This table, Mr. President, I believe does much to remove the smokescreen around what our European allies can and cannot do on their own behalf.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"EXHIBIT F

"CONSUMPTION AND INVESTMENTS EXPRESSED AS PERCENTAGE OF AVAILABLE RESOURCES, SELECTED COUNTRIES, 1958

"(Dollar amounts in millions)¹

| | Consumption of available resources | Percent of total available resources | Investment of available resources | Percent of total available resources | Total available resources |
|---------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| France..... | \$45,538 | 80.6 | \$10,963 | 19.4 | \$56,501 |
| West Germany..... | 38,009 | 74.7 | 12,711 | 25.3 | 50,720 |
| Italy..... | 20,956 | 79.2 | 5,512 | 20.8 | 26,468 |
| United Kingdom..... | 52,100 | 84.4 | 9,700 | 15.6 | 61,800 |
| Japan..... | 20,186 | 72.9 | 7,499 | 27.1 | 27,685 |

¹ Not adjusted for purchasing power disparities.

² Source: Office of Statistics and Reports, ICA, June 15, 1959."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, our great country reinvests only about 15 percent of its gross national product each year. Only 15 percent of our gross national product is plowed back into our economy to expand our production base, to modernize existing capi-

tal facilities, and to lay the foundation for assuring generations as yet unborn the same standard of living we enjoy today.

With that in mind, let us see what our so-called partners in Europe are doing.

France, Mr. President, is reinvesting not

15 percent but nearly 20 percent of its available resources. Italy is reinvesting nearly 21 percent of its own resources. Western Germany, I wish to emphasize, is prosecuting its economic expansion program at a rate nearly twice our own. More than 25 percent of Germany's available resources are being plowed back into its economy compared with 15 percent for our own country.

But here is the best yet. Our former enemy, Japan, whose economic competition has already brought distress to many industries in the United States, is actually reinvesting nearly 30 percent of its available resources to expand its production base.

Mr. President, it seems to me absolutely foolhardy that we should actually be curtailing the resources available for the future growth of our own country in order to pour funds into the military structures of foreign nations—nations which are already expanding their economies at a more rapid rate than is the United States. We are, in effect, paying the bills for economic growth in Western Europe. We are magnanimously carrying a large portion of the defense burden of many of the Western European countries in order to permit them to have more in the way of economic resources in order to foster their own growth, expand their own production; and ultimately add to the unemployment rolls in Detroit, Chicago, West Virginia, and many other portions of the United States.

We have been told on occasion after occasion that economic aid to Western Europe was terminated in 1951. I believe the data I have presented thus far, plus additional material I will offer later on, demonstrate that this is untrue. For every dollar we give our Western European allies to expend for their own defense, one of their own dollars is freed for economic development. Thus we have not stopped economic aid to Western Europe as so many have claimed. It is still being extended to that area in vast quantities. What we have done is to provide this economic assistance in an indirect manner, instead of pouring it into European economies directly.

I fully expect that some of my colleagues are presently thinking to themselves that the availability of resources for investment might not be a true test of the ability of various countries to defend themselves. They doubtless will take the position that shouldering a greater defense burden would bring economic stagnation to Europe. It is doubtless true that economic strength in the free world is a great deterrent to the spread of communism and other obnoxious isms.

In this connection, I would be the last to seek to impose a double standard of economic development on our European friends, but if, as the title states, this is indeed, a "mutual security program," then it strikes me that our NATO allies, and other countries we have helped so generously in the past, should carry a fair share of the burdens, as well as enjoy an abundance of its benefits.

I have data, Mr. President, which demonstrate that if our European friends reinvested about the same percentage of their available resources as does our own country, vast amounts of additional funds could be made available for their own defense, and they could actually be aiding us in furthering the development of backward nations throughout the world.

Earlier in my remarks, I referred to the fact that the United States reinvests about 15 percent of our own annual gross national product each year, while many of our alleged friends are investing nearly double that amount.

What would happen if selected countries of Western Europe and Japan reduced their annual reinvestments to our own level of 15 percent of gross national product?

Here is what would happen, Mr. President. I hold in my hand exhibit G, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a total of nearly \$13 billion would be made available for other purposes if this course were followed. For four countries of Western Europe alone, that is, France, West Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom, growth investments maintained at a rate about equal to our own, or would make available the sum of nearly \$10 billion—an amount which, in my opinion, could and should be spent for their domestic defense, and to help lift from our shoulders the burdens we have carried alone for much too long throughout the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas would be generous enough to yield me 5 minutes on the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. These data demonstrate conclusively, Mr. President, that the only thing "mutual" about the mutual security program is its name. Our allies get all the benefits while Uncle Sam bears all the burdens.

The time has come for us to call a halt. The only way we can prevail upon our European allies to do their fair share is to serve notice that unless they do so, Uncle Sam will cut off further aid. Experience has amply demonstrated that the United Kingdom, France, Italy, and a host of other countries will lean upon us just as long as we permit them to do so.

As a practical matter, Mr. President, our European friends and a few other nations we are still aiding, have become so prosperous that, in some instances, their dollar holdings have increased to a point where they are actually beginning to convert those dollars into gold, at our expense, in rising amounts.

I hold in my hand a table which shows that the gold assets and dollar holdings of the continental Western European nations actually increased by over \$3.7 billion from December 31, 1957, to December 31, 1958.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table in exhibit H be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. Thus it seems clear that in addition to reinvesting large amounts of money in their own economies, many of our European allies are actually increasing their dollar holdings or using dollars to purchase gold. I refer specifically to the following countries, which show considerable increases in dollar and gold holdings over the past calendar year: United Kingdom, an increase of \$850 million; France, an increase of \$188 million; Western Germany, an increase of \$295 million; the Netherlands, an increase of \$453 million; Italy, an increase of \$677 million.

I would also like to inform Senators that the dollars which our military assistance to Western Europe have so generously relieved those countries from spending on themselves are being used in many instances to actually deplete our own gold reserves. During 1958 the following European countries converted large amounts of their dollar holdings into gold at the expense of the United States:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table entitled "United States Net Monetary Gold Transactions With Foreign 1954-59," and labeled "Exhibit B," printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

"EXHIBIT G

"ANNUAL INVESTMENTS AND CONSUMPTION, SELECTED COUNTRIES, 1958

"[In million of dollars]"

| "Country | Gross national product (at market prices) | Net foreign balance, inflow (+) or outflow (—) | Total available resources | Total consumption | Total investment | Assumed investment of 15 percent of available resources | Excess present investment over assumed norm of 15 percent |
|---------------------|---|--|---------------------------|-------------------|------------------|---|---|
| France..... | 56,203 | +298 | 56,501 | 45,538 | 10,963 | 8,475 | 2,488 |
| West Germany..... | 52,940 | -2,220 | 50,720 | 38,009 | 12,711 | 7,608 | 5,103 |
| Italy..... | 26,496 | -28 | 26,468 | 20,956 | 5,512 | 3,970 | 1,542 |
| United Kingdom..... | 63,750 | -1,950 | 61,800 | 52,100 | 9,700 | 9,270 | 430 |
| Japan..... | 28,169 | -484 | 27,685 | 20,186 | 7,499 | 4,152 | 3,347 |
| Total..... | | | | | | | 12,910 |

"^a Not adjusted for purchasing power disparities.

"Source: Office of Statistics and Reports, ICA, June 15, 1959."

"EXHIBIT H

"ESTIMATED GOLD RESERVES AND DOLLAR HOLDINGS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

"[In millions of dollars]"

| "Area and country | Dec. 31, 1956 | Dec. 31, 1957 | Dec. 31, 1958 | Increase (+) or decrease (—), 1958 over 1957 |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|--|
| Continental Western Europe: | | | | |
| Austria..... | 367 | 452 | 605 | +153 |
| Belgium-Luxembourg (includes Belgian Congo)..... | 1,227 | 1,182 | 1,522 | +340 |
| Denmark..... | 96 | 143 | 200 | +57 |
| Finland..... | 88 | 99 | 104 | +5 |
| France (and dependencies) ¹ | 1,505 | 946 | 1,134 | +188 |
| West Germany..... | 3,329 | 4,099 | 4,394 | +295 |
| Greece..... | 187 | 167 | 139 | -28 |
| Italy..... | 1,268 | 1,531 | 2,208 | +677 |
| Netherlands (West Indies and Surinam)..... | 1,071 | 1,044 | 1,497 | +453 |
| Norway..... | 117 | 138 | 172 | +34 |
| Portugal (and dependencies)..... | 628 | 651 | 707 | +56 |
| Spain (and dependencies)..... | 176 | 126 | 106 | -20 |
| Sweden..... | 483 | 479 | 507 | +28 |
| Switzerland..... | 2,512 | 2,685 | 2,778 | +93 |
| Turkey..... | 164 | 162 | 164 | +2 |
| Other..... | 917 | 851 | 1,370 | +519 |
| Total..... | 14,135 | 14,755 | 17,607 | +2,852 |
| Sterling area: | | | | |
| United Kingdom..... | 2,812 | 2,875 | 3,725 | +850 |
| United Kingdom dependencies..... | 103 | 104 | 110 | +6 |
| Australia..... | 191 | 211 | 241 | +30 |
| India..... | 323 | 329 | 324 | -5 |
| Union of South Africa..... | 277 | 255 | 241 | -14 |
| Other..... | 228 | 228 | 251 | +23 |
| Total..... | 3,934 | 4,002 | 4,892 | +800 |
| Canada..... | 2,629 | 3,738 | 3,083 | +345 |
| Latin America..... | 4,123 | 4,368 | 4,009 | -359 |
| Asia: | | | | |
| Japan..... | 1,145 | 714 | 1,098 | +384 |
| Other..... | 1,650 | 1,610 | 1,543 | -67 |
| Total..... | 2,795 | 2,324 | 2,641 | +317 |
| All other (includes international institutions)..... | 3,511 | 3,087 | 3,206 | +119 |
| Grand total..... | 31,127 | 31,274 | 35,438 | +4,164 |

"¹ Excludes gold holdings of French Exchange Stabilization Fund.

"Source: Federal Reserve Bulletin, March 1959."

"EXHIBIT B

"U.S. NET MONETARY GOLD TRANSACTIONS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, 1954-59

"[In millions of dollars at \$35 per fine troy ounce. Negative figures represent net sales by the United States; positive figures, net purchases]"

| "Country | Calendar year | | | | | 1st quarter, 1959 |
|---|---------------|-------|-------|------|--------|-------------------|
| | 1954 | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | 1958 | |
| Afghanistan..... | | | | -0.6 | | |
| Argentina..... | | | 115.3 | 75.4 | 67.2 | |
| Austria..... | -6.2 | | | | -84.2 | |
| Bank for International Settlements..... | -20.0 | | | | -178.3 | -7.0 |
| Belgium..... | | | 3.4 | 3.4 | -329.4 | |
| Bolivia..... | 17.3 | 3.5 | | | | |
| Canada..... | | | 14.6 | 5.2 | | |
| Chile..... | | | | 2.8 | 3.0 | |
| Colombia..... | | | 28.1 | | | |
| Denmark..... | | | | 7.0 | -17.0 | |
| El Salvador..... | | | | -3.5 | | |
| France..... | | -67.5 | -33.8 | | | |

See footnote at end of table

"EXHIBIT B—Continued

"U.S. NET MONETARY GOLD TRANSACTIONS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, 1954-59—Continued

"[In millions of dollars at \$35 per fine troy ounce. Negative figures represent net sales by the United States; positive figures, net purchases]

| Country | Calendar year | | | | | 1st quarter, 1959 |
|----------------------------------|---------------|-------|--------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| | 1954 | 1955 | 1956 | 1957 | 1958 | |
| Germany..... | -225.6 | -10.0 | | | | |
| Indonesia..... | | | | -2.0 | | |
| International Monetary Fund..... | | -2.7 | 200.0 | 599.7 | -7.1 | -8.8 |
| Iran..... | | -3 | | -3 | -2.3 | |
| Israel..... | -1.1 | | | | | |
| Italy..... | | | | | -348.8 | |
| Japan..... | | | | | -30.1 | -49.9 |
| Korea..... | | -1.9 | | | | |
| Lebanon..... | -8.8 | | | | | |
| Mexico..... | 80.3 | | | | | |
| Netherlands..... | | | | 25.0 | -260.9 | -29.9 |
| Peru..... | | | | 3.0 | | |
| Philippines..... | | | | 21.9 | 6.9 | 5.0 |
| Portugal..... | -54.9 | -5.0 | | | -20.0 | |
| Spain..... | | | | 31.5 | 31.7 | |
| Surinam..... | | | | | -2.5 | |
| Sweden..... | -15.0 | | 15.2 | | | |
| Switzerland..... | -15.5 | | -8.0 | | -215.2 | |
| United Kingdom..... | -50.0 | | 100.3 | | -900.0 | |
| Uruguay..... | -5.0 | 11.0 | 29.1 | 3.1 | | |
| Vatican..... | 8.8 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 1.0 | -3.5 | -1.2 |
| Venezuela..... | -30.0 | | -200.0 | | | |
| Others..... | -1.0 | .4 | 12.9 | -1.4 | -3.8 | -9.9 |
| Total..... | -326.6 | -68.5 | 280.2 | 771.6 | -2,294.2 | -92.6 |

"Includes \$13,100,000 Rumanian-owned gold blocked under Executive Order No. 10644, and pursuant to Public Law 285, 84th Cong., Aug. 9, 1955, among assets vested and liquidated, their proceeds to be distributed to American claimants against Rumania.

"Note: Figures may not add to totals because of rounding.

"Source: Treasury Department, Office of International Finance."

"EXHIBIT J

"REPORTED GOLD RESERVES OF CENTRAL BANKS AND GOVERNMENTS, SELECTED COUNTRIES

"[In millions of dollars]

| "End of month | Estimated total world ¹ | United States | France ² | West Germany | Italy | United Kingdom ³ | Netherlands | Belgium |
|--------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------|-------|-----------------------------|-------------|---------|
| 1952—December..... | 36,000 | 23,252 | 573 | 140 | 346 | 1,846 | 544 | 706 |
| 1953—December..... | 36,435 | 22,091 | 576 | 328 | 346 | 1,518 | 737 | 776 |
| 1954—December..... | 37,080 | 21,793 | 576 | 626 | 346 | 2,762 | 796 | 778 |
| 1955—December..... | 37,740 | 21,753 | 861 | 920 | 352 | 2,120 | 865 | 929 |
| 1956—December..... | 38,245 | 22,058 | 861 | 1,494 | 338 | 2,133 | 844 | 928 |
| 1957—December..... | 38,970 | 22,857 | 575 | 2,542 | 452 | 2,273 | 744 | 913 |
| 1958—January..... | | 22,860 | 575 | 2,501 | 457 | 2,404 | 792 | 946 |
| February..... | | 22,736 | 575 | 2,489 | 462 | 2,539 | 828 | 967 |
| March..... | 39,135 | 22,487 | 575 | 2,460 | 462 | 2,770 | 847 | 998 |
| April..... | | 22,042 | 575 | 2,492 | 417 | 2,914 | 862 | 1,028 |
| May..... | | 21,674 | 575 | 2,499 | 491 | 3,039 | 881 | 1,099 |
| June..... | 39,395 | 21,412 | 575 | 2,575 | 607 | 3,076 | 910 | 1,143 |
| July..... | | 21,275 | 589 | 2,581 | 677 | 3,084 | 920 | 1,182 |
| August..... | | 21,082 | 589 | 2,587 | 754 | 3,089 | 944 | 1,213 |
| September..... | 39,545 | 20,929 | 589 | 2,597 | 847 | 3,120 | 956 | 1,228 |
| October..... | | 20,741 | 589 | 2,633 | 907 | 3,174 | 999 | 1,251 |
| November..... | | 20,653 | 589 | 2,639 | 995 | 3,215 | 1,026 | 1,270 |
| December..... | 39,865 | 20,582 | 589 | 2,086 | 1,069 | 3,111 | 1,050 | 1,270 |
| 1949—January..... | | 20,527 | 589 | | | | 1,125 | 1,248 |

"¹ Represents reported gold holdings of central banks, governments, and international institutions; unpublished holdings of various central banks and governments; estimated holdings of British exchange equalization account based on figures shown for United Kingdom; and estimated official holdings of countries from which no reports are received.

"² Represents holdings of Bank of France (holdings of French Exchange Stabilization Fund are not included).

"³ Beginning with December 1958, represents exchange equalization account gold and convertible currency reserves, as reported by British Government; prior to that time represents reserves of gold and United States and Canadian dollars.

"Note: Federal Reserve Bulletin, March 1959, p. 335."

Mr. ELLENDER. As the table shows, some of these conversions were as follows: The United Kingdom, \$900 million; Italy, \$349 million; Denmark, \$17 million; Belgium, \$329 million; Spain, \$31.7 million; the Netherlands, \$261 million.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the long-range trend in gold shifts seems to be entirely against our own country, and in favor of those nations whom we have aided, and whom we are still assisting.

I have here a table entitled "Reported Gold Reserves of Central Banks and Governments, Selected Countries, December 1952 Through December 1958."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that table, identified as table J, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ELLENDER. This is what that table shows.

Between December 1952 and the end of 1958 U.S. gold reserves declined by approximately \$2.7 billion—from 23.2 billion to 20.5 billion.

Now, what has happened to some of our European allies?

Western Germany: Gold reserves are up by about \$2.5 billion from 140 million in December 1952, to \$2.6 billion by December 1958.

The United Kingdom: Gold reserves have increased by about \$1.3 billion, from 1.8 billion in December 1952, to \$3.1 billion by December 1958.

Italy: Gold reserves up by nearly a billion dollars, from \$346 million in 1952 to \$1.1 billion in 1958.

Netherlands: Gold reserves up by about \$600 million, from 544 million in 1952, to \$1.1 billion in December, 1958.

I remind Senators that the periods compared are 1952 and 1958. Nineteen fifty-two, the Senate will recall, was 1 year after the executive branch purportedly stopped direct economic aid to Western Europe, presumably on the premise that recovery had been achieved there, as a result of the Marshall plan.

The data I have referred to go far beyond recovery. They demonstrate great prosperity—prosperity which we continue to subsidize at the expense of curtailing our own growth.

Mr. President, I hope and pray that the Senate will adopt this amendment, which as I have explained, would cut \$550 million from the military aid program. In the past we have actually appropriated in excess of \$24 billion for that purpose. We have in the pipeline more than \$2½ billion—almost \$3 billion. I repeat that our friends across the seas, particularly in Western Europe, are now well able to take care of their own military establishments, if only they would do as much as we are now doing.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 15, pp. 19317-19322]

MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1960

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, one of the most arduous peacetime sessions of Congress is now in its closing hours. We have all worked especially long and hard during the past few weeks in an effort to complete our work.

Thus, Mr. President, I am acutely aware of the fact that Senators are tired and are eager to close out this session of Congress. However, I must ask the forbearance of my colleagues. To my mind, we would be remiss in our duty if we simply approved the pending bill, calling for appropriations to the mutual security program, merely because we want to go home.

Mr. President, the pending measure poses a real threat to the economic stability of our Government, and it is now up to the Senate to act in order to reduce, if not eliminate, this threat.

Title I of this bill would make available to our foreign aid program a total of \$3,281,813,000 for this fiscal year.

May I point out to Senators that should this body approve this additional appropriation, the total amount of money made available for foreign aid since the end of World War II will reach an amount in excess of \$83 billion.

I also would like to point out that during this same period of time, the U.S. Government spent only \$11 billion on our much maligned public works programs.

In other words, we have spent more than seven times as much on improving foreign countries as we have to conserve and preserve our own precious resources of soil and water.

In this connection, I recall that the distinguished minority leader made the statement earlier this week that the Senate should uphold the President's veto of the second public works bill on the grounds that it was in the economic interest of our country to do so.

The minority leader said:

"There were 46 million youngsters who entered the schools of America this month. They will be the trustees of this country in the future. They are the future custodians. If we mess up the fiscal picture now, what will happen to them? They will have to pay the bill for our mistakes, for our sins of omission and commission."

The distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] made the statement in connection with his objection to spending some \$800 million in future years for public works in our own country.

Yet the pending bill contains more than four times that amount of spending in foreign countries for this year alone.

Mr. President, I too am gravely concerned over the condition in which we will hand over our country to our grandchildren. I also wonder about the ever-increasing debt load we are bequeathing to the young people of our great country.

In my opinion, the continuation of this wasteful program, which is concerned only with the flinging of American dollars to all corners of the globe, with little or no consideration being given to the impact of this spending on our own domestic economy, is of far greater danger to this country than a modest, well planned, and long-range program of public works.

For one thing, we can see at the very minimum a dollar's worth of accomplishment for every dollar spent on domestic programs. I will not attempt to compute the minute particle, if any, of the value we obtain for every dollar we pour into the foreign aid rathole.

Mr. President, this foreign aid program has become a devouring monster, seeking to suck the very lifeblood out of our economy. I recall the story of the man who adopted a young lion cub. As the cub grew into young lionhood, the man's friends warned him that the animal might become dangerous. He scoffed at these stories, saying that he knew the lion recognized him as a friend and would not attack him. But one night the man accidentally cut himself. The lion got one taste of the blood, and unhappily that was the end of the man who forsook the advice of his friends.

In my judgment, our foreign aid program, which commenced its existence as a lion cub, is now a full-grown lion and is now ready to devour its master.

When this program was begun at the end of World War II, it was estimated that it would cost about \$15 billion to restore the war-ravaged economies of the countries of Western Europe.

This goal was attained by 1953, at which time the economies of the countries of Western Europe had reached unprecedented heights. Yet we have continued to pour billions of taxpayer dollars into these countries since that year and are continuing to do so in the pending bill.

Mr. President, I supported the original Marshall plan and continued to support the program as long as its objectives had not been reached. For this I have no apologies.

However, as soon as the countries of Western Europe were restored to economic health, and the foreign aid program had reached the goals for which it was created, I ceased to support it.

Instead, for the past 7 years I have advocated a gradual tapering off of this program. In my judgment, the program will never end until we begin to slow it down.

The nations of Western Europe will continue to take our money as long as we offer it to them. They will continue to lean on our shoulders.

That is why, Mr. President, I have fought for gradual reductions in the program. Although I have been successful on occasion in securing some reductions in the foreign aid appropriations, I have never been able to reach my ultimate objective, namely, a gradual decrease in expenditures for this wasteful giveaway, because any time reductions have been made, the subsequent year's budget estimate has been inflated to cover the cuts of the previous year.

This year, despite the way our national debt has grown, the President saw fit to increase his request for foreign aid 26 percent over and above the amount for last year.

Even in this day and time, when my predictions that a continuation of this program would weaken our economy are unhappily coming true, I have been unable to get the Committee on Appropriations to cut one thin dime below the amount appropriated by the House for fiscal year 1960, which, by the way, is \$95.3 million less than the amount in the

pending Senate Appropriations Committee bill.

Mr. President, I fear that the time has come for drastic action. We can no longer afford to gamble with our country's economic security. Certainly Congress has not hesitated this year to provide adequately for our military security, but this will go for naught unless we maintain a sound economy.

I ask Senators to consider these unvarnished facts, which, I feel, show the precarious position in which our economy finds itself, mostly because of this senseless giveaway program:

During calendar year 1958, the United States lost the record amount of \$2.3 billion of its gold reserves.

During this same period, the dollar balances and gold reserves of the other countries of the free world increased by \$4.2 billion.

For the first time since the War Between the States, the United States had a deficit balance of payments in 1958, totaling \$3.3 billion, even though it had a favorable balance of trade of approximately \$1.7 billion. What is more, for calendar year 1959 it is estimated that the United States will again have a deficit balance of payments in the neighborhood of \$5 billion.

Our national debt today stands close to \$290 billion, which is approximately \$55 billion more than the national debts of all the other countries of the world, including Soviet Russia.

The value of the U.S. dollar has been steadily declining and is now at the point where it is worth about 48 cents in terms of 1939 dollars. In addition, there is increasing speculation that the United States may eventually be forced to devalue the dollar—something which has never been done in our glorious history.

Foreign countries have invested about \$6.2 billion in New York in short-term Government securities. This has the effect of having the Federal Government borrow money on the open markets from foreign countries at high interest rates, and then lend that same money back to foreign governments at low interest rates—if indeed the money is not given to these countries as an outright grant.

Mr. President, I have before me an article published in the New York Times of Sunday, September 6, 1959, dealing with the economic dangers which face our country. The article states, in part:

"As financial officials see the situation it will do no good to any one if there is a larger outflow of (foreign) aid dollars, but the dollar becomes of dubious value. This could happen, it is believed, if U.S. payments deficits continue on a large scale for many more years.

"Such a deficit means that foreign countries as a whole obtain more dollars than they spend to buy American goods. They can take the difference in gold or can keep it in dollars and invest them in the financial markets in New York.

"These invested dollars are potential claims against gold. Already they total \$15,651,000,000 not far below our gold reserves which have dwindled to \$19,514,000,000.

"As the claims grow and the gold stock declines, U.S. short-term liabilities might eventually exceed assets."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"BIG TRADE DEFICIT IS SPARKING MOVE TO CUT AID FUNDS—UNITED STATES WORRIED BY DECREASE IN GOLD STOCKPILE AND RISE IN FOREIGN ASSETS HERE

"(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

"WASHINGTON, September 5.—The big deficit in the U.S. balance of international pay-

ments, with its resulting outflow of gold and buildup of foreign assets in New York, has begun to have a major impact on administration thinking about foreign aid.

"Powerful voices, centering in financial agencies, have begun to argue that the flow of Government capital abroad in the form of aid is too large for the continued strength of the dollar.

"The underlying belief in top administration financial circles is that there is an entirely new situation in the world economy, with European currencies gaining strength while the dollar is showing the first faint signs of vulnerability.

"Emotions in conflict

"The immediate results of this view came in President Eisenhower's trip to Europe, during which he urged that European nations undertake a far greater share of the burden of helping underdeveloped countries.

"In a sense, the administration is torn between two powerful emotions. One stems from acceptance of the basic idea that the underdeveloped countries must be helped in the interest of the United States as well as for the good of those nations that get aid.

"The other is a growing fear for the future stability of the dollar unless two related things happen: Domestic finances are controlled and the balance of international transactions is righted. The U.S. deficit in international transactions was \$3,400 million last year and will probably be even larger this year.

"Future seems gloomy

"As financial officials see the situation, it will do no good to anyone if there is a larger outflow of aid dollars but the dollar becomes of dubious value. This could happen, it is believed, if U.S. payments deficits continue on a large scale for many more years.

"Such a deficit means that foreign countries as a whole obtain more dollars than they spend to buy American goods. They can take the difference in gold or can keep it in dollars and invest them in the financial markets in New York. These invested dollars are potential claims against gold. Already the total \$15,651 million, not far below the gold reserve, which has dwindled to \$19,524 million.

"As the claims grow and the gold stock declines, U.S. short-term liabilities might eventually exceed assets. Even that would not necessarily mean a run on gold or some other crises. But U.S. Officials do not like to contemplate even the remotest possibility of such an event.

"Besides, some of them, looking ahead, are unhappy at the thought of potential pressure on the United States from what, in effect, would be its foreign creditors. The United States, which has been exerting the pressure for years, does not want to be on the receiving end.

"Foreign countries are already substantial creditors of the U.S. Government. They have invested about \$6,200 million in New York in short-term Government securities. Thus, as one high official puts it, 'we're borrowing short from foreigners at home and lending abroad long.'

"The recent deterioration in the U.S. balance of payments has come about mainly because of a drop in exports and a rise in imports, not because of an increase in foreign aid. But as financial officials view the situation, foreign aid is the one element in the total balance over which the Government has considerable control.

"It is regarded as certain that the new line of thought in the administration will be a major theme in conversations with foreign finance ministers at the annual meeting here later this month of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

"European countries have been running

strong surpluses in their balance of payments while the United States has been in deficit.

"To U.S. officials this means only one thing: Europe should become a much bigger exporter of capital and the United States a smaller one.

"New view on investments"

"Officials worried about international payments deficits are even beginning to take a less enthusiastic view of investment abroad by American business. Up until very recently, this was welcomed on every count, by conservatives and liberals alike.

"Now, with the payments deficit uppermost in many minds, an investment abroad is frequently seen as a double blow—first an immediate outflow of dollars, and, second, a probable setback to American exports. The export loss occurs when an American manufacturer, for example, builds a plant in Europe to share in the common market rather than try to sell goods made in the United States.

"This feeling accounts for the Treasury's opposition to a bill to provide new tax incentives for foreign investment unless its benefits are limited to investments in underdeveloped countries.

"A reflection of the growing concern about the international payments position of the United States came in the administration position on the Development Loan Fund in the foreign aid bill. The President refused to support a Senate move to put the fund's financing on a long-term basis, increase its lending authority, and get around the Appropriations Committee, even though the President's original position backed all three ideas.

"Another reflection of the new line of thought, paradoxically, is U.S. support for the new International Development Association, even though this will cost the United States \$330 million. Such a new institution has several merits in the eyes of an official worried about the U.S. payments deficits and the problem of the underdeveloped countries.

"It puts Europe in the lending picture for the first time on a formal, multilateral scale.

"Because it will be equipped to make 'soft' loans—loans with easy terms and repayable in the currency of the borrower—it should eventually ease the pressure for a larger and larger Development Loan Fund in the United States. The loan fund also makes this type of loan."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I think it is very clear to anyone who will take the time to seriously consider these facts that the economic stability of this Nation is periled by this situation.

On the one hand, our national debt is growing higher, while, at the same time, the demand for U.S. bonds is lessening to the point that Congress has been asked to remove the present limitation on interest rates for these securities.

Furthermore, we are continuing to pour millions of dollars into the very countries which are our economic opponents in the peaceful battle for world trade.

The current foreign aid program has been disguised by its bureaucratic bosses as a program which gives aid only to underdeveloped countries of the world. They contend that they want to help only the people who cannot help themselves or have not been able to help themselves.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is merely frosting on the cake.

The pending bill contains an item of \$1.3 billion for direct military assistance to the free-world countries. Yet approximately half of this money is programed, not for the underdeveloped nations of the world, but for the prosperous countries of Western Europe.

In my humble judgment, the countries of Western Europe are well able to bear their own defense burdens, instead of looking to

Uncle Sam to foot the bill for their own protection.

Since we have been generous with the countries of Western Europe in the past, and have restored them to economic health, it is folly for us to continue to help equip their armies, when all we accomplish thereby is to permit them to be more competitive with us in economic fields.

In addition, many of the dollars spent on the loan and grant programs carried out under foreign aid to the underdeveloped countries of the world, end up in Western Europe, simply because we do not place any restrictions on where the dollars may be spent.

In that connection, Mr. President, consider the Development Loan Fund program. There are no restrictions as to how and where loan proceeds from the Development Loan Fund must be spent. Loans can be made to India, Pakistan, or any other country in the world. Yet, after we lend them dollars, they can spend those dollars anywhere they desire. Believe me, Mr. President, when I say the record shows that a large amount of this money is spent in Europe. In other words, our dollars ultimately further develop the economies of the countries of Western Europe which now are very prosperous.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wonder whether the Senator from Louisiana has had called to his attention the point that in the case of some of these loans which are made in good dollars, and which we hope will be repaid in what is very soft currency, in most instances the borrowers disregard American contractors, when arranging for the construction of the dams, roads, and other projects, and prefer to use European contractors, and pay them with these dollars; and we wind up with a mess of soft currency, for which we do not have the slightest use; and the American people, who have to pay the taxes from which this money is obtained, have no opportunity whatsoever to participate in that work.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from Georgia is entirely correct. The record shows that 80 percent of the loans made under the development loan fund program are repaid in soft currencies, and only 20 percent are repaid in hard currencies.

As the Senator from Georgia has just stated, when the loans are made, the borrowers purchase goods wherever they can obtain them for the least amount of money; they place their contracts with those who will do the work, provide the goods, for the least amount of money. Under those circumstances, few purchases are made in our country. Few Americans benefit. Believe me when I say that, Mr. President.

For instance, when the borrowers have purchased turbines with which to generate electricity from falling water, many of the generators have been purchased from firms located in Germany, France, Italy, and the United Kingdom.

Here we are providing dollars with which to assist the underdeveloped countries. However, not only is the money spent in the prosperous countries of Western Europe, but the money is ultimately used—as I shall point out later in my remarks—to further deplete our gold reserves. Whenever our dollars get into the hands of a foreign country, that country can convert them into gold, if they so desire. American citizens cannot do this, but whenever any of the money which flows out of our country falls into the hands of a foreign country, that country can obtain our gold for it. That is why our gold reserves have been decreasing recently, Mr. President.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. Presi-

dent, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true that several of the countries to which we are now lending our money obtain it at low rates of interest and then turn around and lend the money to other nations at higher rates of interest?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and I was somewhat amused a while ago to hear the Senator from New York plead with the Senate to appropriate \$500 million more for the Development Loan Fund for the year 1961. His reason for this was the hope that we could entice our friends in Western Europe to inaugurate a fund with which to assist us in aiding underdeveloped countries.

Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I would not wish to see our country put up another dime in that connection. There will be ample opportunity for the Congress to appropriate additional funds whenever the countries of Western Europe show their hands, and clearly show that they are moving in that direction. Certainly there is no indication that such is the case, because in the pending bill we are giving them over \$600 million of grant aid.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not also true that at the present time Western Germany is paying back the money it borrowed from us, although she could pay it back much more rapidly, but, at the same time, she is lending money to the countries of Africa at high rates of interest?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. One cannot find harder working people than the people of Western Germany. But the record shows that because of the presence of our troops in Western Germany, much money is spent there annually, by our Government, to sustain our own troops.

I say to the Senate that today Germany and the other countries of Western Europe are so prosperous that they should be able to carry their own military burdens.

But the amendment which I will submit will still leave in excess of half a billion dollars for military assistance to Western Europe.

As I have stated, all I am requesting is a cut of \$100 million—I ask my colleagues to remember that—in the amount which otherwise would be provided for military aid. Over \$600 million in military assistance provided by this bill will go to countries which are the most prosperous, namely, the countries of Western Europe, exclusive of Greece and Turkey.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield again to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me add that not only are many of these countries as prosperous as the United States is, but, in addition, they certainly do not have to mortgage their futures, in order to take care of these expenditures.

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly the Senator from Georgia is correct.

Simply stated, Mr. President, we are using our money to subsidize industry in the prosperous countries of the world, so that they can compete with us. We do not have to be experts in economics to realize that this competition is now beginning to hurt our own domestic business enterprises.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to make a statement, and then ask a question. If the information which I read a few days ago, to the effect that the United States has a larger national debt than all of the other nations on the face of the earth put together is true, then these other nations are better off than we are.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I tell my good friend that I have just stated for the Record that

our debt is \$55 billion more than the combined debts of all the other countries in the world, including Russia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is talking about the state of prosperity of countries which are still getting large amounts of money from the American taxpayer. Would the Senator like to comment on the difference between the amount of taxes which are collected in this country from our taxpayers and the taxes that are not collected from the taxpayers of those other countries?

Mr. ELLENDER. In the past I have placed in the RECORD lists of those taxes. Of all the countries in Western Europe, the British people are about the only ones who pay in full measure. Britain has ways and means of forcing her people to pay their taxes, as is done in our own country. But when we consider the situation in France, Italy, Greece and other countries in Western Europe, we find that about the only taxes the people actually pay there are excise taxes. When it comes to income taxes, those people are able to evade them.

May I say that with the prosperity now being enjoyed by Europe, if those countries could actually collect the taxes from their citizens which their laws impose, they would not need a dollar from us. On the contrary, they could be assisting us to carry the load of helping underdeveloped countries.

As I have said many times before on this floor, so long as we provide the dollars, I do not expect the countries of Western Europe to make a move toward helping the underdeveloped countries. They are going to continue to lean on us so long as we permit them to do so.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Louisiana has put his finger on what is a very vital problem, which we are going to have to face. I have been severely criticized for trying to make savings on what I considered to be inexcusable waste in the foreign aid program. One of them involves this very point. I do not propose to vote hundreds of millions of dollars to be used by these prosperous countries, because what it really adds up to, when one gets to the bottom of it, is that we are asking the taxpayers of the United States to assume the tax burdens of a lot of tax evaders in those countries that are getting hundreds of millions of dollars from us, when those taxpayers are capable of paying a heavier tax load. They are "passing the buck"—and I think that is a good figure of speech—to the American taxpayer.

Mr. ELLENDER. The distinguished Senator from Oregon is right. I go back to the proposition I previously referred to, namely, that the countries of Western Europe have never been as prosperous as they are today. I am not permitted to state what each country obtains by way of cash from our country by virtue of the presence of our Armed Forces in their countries, but such expenditures for the current year will amount to over \$3 billion.

We send money abroad to maintain our own troops and to carry out our share of obligations under the NATO, SEATO, and other agreements.

To further answer my good friend from Oregon, as I have just pointed out, almost every dollar that we appropriate in this country for the Development Loan Fund will not find its way back to our own country. Instead, the borrowers are going to purchase what they need where they can get those products the cheapest—and that is in Western Europe or Japan.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that our gold reserves are the lowest now that they have been in some 20 years?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. We have a little over \$19 billion in gold reserves, when only a few years ago such reserves totaled some \$24 billion.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that for 1958 our net balance of payments showed a deficit of \$3 billion?

Mr. ELLENDER. If I may advise my friend, it will be \$5 billion in 1959.

Mr. TALMADGE. So all the money that we spend overseas in this effort will help increase the net deficit in our balance of payments; is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right. That is what we are doing. I do not want to say to Senators that the foreign aid program is entirely responsible for that. I do not say that.

Mr. TALMADGE. But it is a contributing factor?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the major contributing factor.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not also true that many American manufacturers and corporations are building branch factories abroad, so they can utilize relatively cheap labor in reference to the cost of ours, and employ people in those countries, while our own people are losing jobs in this country? In other words, we are exporting jobs as well as sending money overseas. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. I do not recall the exact figures now, but it is my recollection that during the past 4 or 5 years the export of our capital to England alone has increased 8 or 9 times. What is happening is that General Motors, Ford, and other large U.S. companies find it convenient to build factories abroad to take advantage of cheaper labor. Of course, that means an additional outflow of American dollars. All of those facts added together increase the deficit in our balance of payments and put us in the red in so far as that balance is concerned.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished Senator. I compliment him on the fight he is making for the American people, the taxpayers, and the American economy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator will recall, I am sure, that some years ago we were told we had to give \$17 billion to Europe because they would not be able to pay it back. Let me ask the Senator if it is not true that those same European countries now hold enough dollar credits to practically empty Fort Knox. We have given it to them, and they now have all the money it would take to pay it back, if they had the desire to do it.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out, foreign nations hold almost \$16 billion in claims against our Government in the way of dollars, bond, and other securities.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is held by those same countries.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course. They are all prosperous now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Out of the \$17 billion we gave to them \$2½ billion was applied to abolish the national debts in 6 countries.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also wish to point out that today we are suffering the results of some of the things we did in this field a few years ago. Since that time some of our hard-earned cash has been used to develop automobile factories in France and Italy. Now those factories are in competition with U.S. factories. One can see these little "bugs" going about the streets in abundance. [Laughter.] I do not know what the increase in such vehicles has been, but every time I go from my apartment to the Capitol

I see those little cars in abundance. Sometimes I feel as though I will run over them. They are on the streets in huge numbers, and the increase will no doubt continue.

As I have pointed out, we are making it possible, through the expenditure of our borrowed dollars, the outflow of capital from the United States and for foreign competition to flourish. These expenditures are going to cause us to have a deficit in our balance of payments of about \$5 billion this year. If we continue it will mean either more taxes for our people or that we will go deeper into the red.

What has made America great is the initiative of our people. We can destroy that initiative overnight if we foist on the American taxpayer a tax burden so great as to stifle initiative.

Mr. President, what really makes me angry is to see the prosperous countries of Western Europe not only balancing their budgets but decreasing the taxes. We are sending borrowed money to those countries, and now we are being asked to raise the ante on our own interest rates. Why, Mr. President, every time we raise the interest rate 1 percent on our huge debt we add to our tax load a carrying charge of \$2.9 billion per year.

Imagine that.

And yet that situation is going to exist until we start to reduce our debt. I cannot see any possibility of our reducing our debt in bad times, if we cannot do it in good times.

Let us consider last year. The record shows that with all the prosperity in our country our national debt increased \$12½ billion. If in good times we cannot reduce our debt, what is going to happen in bad times?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Is it not true that we have paid off the national debts of six European countries with our foreign aid money, and we are now deeper in debt than all the nations on earth put together?

Mr. ELLENDER. Plus \$55 billion, I want to remind my colleague.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I will ask the Senator if, as a matter of fact, Congress has made any bona fide effort to pay off any part of the national debt?

Mr. ELLENDER. We could not. Our expenditures are greater than the amount we take in.

I will say to my good friend, he will remember that we were supposed to have a balanced budget during fiscal year 1958. I think we were in the black by about \$1.5 billion. However, within 3 or 4 months after June 30 we were in the red again. What happened, I believe, is that we did not pay our bills on time, and therefore a little money was left over. There has not been a legitimate balanced budget in this country for many years.

Mr. ERVIN. Is this not the tragic truth: That the Congress has been appropriating the unearned income of unborn generations of Americans who are to be left as a legacy the biggest debt which one generation ever saddled upon another?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about that. Our debt has never been so great as it is now. I hate to say it, but I do not see how we will be able to pay it. When our country's national debt is more than that of the rest of the world put together—including Russia—plus \$55 billion, it is time for the Senate to take a good look before we continue these programs.

Mr. President, it is my considered opinion that there are two areas in the pending bill where cuts could very easily be made—namely, military assistance and defense support.

Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk, the purpose of which is to cut the military support program from \$1.3 billion to \$1.2 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,300,000,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$1,200,000,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this amendment would reduce the amount of money for military assistance by \$100 million. I might point out at this time that this amendment was rejected by our own Appropriations Committee by a tie vote of 13 to 13.

As I have previously stated, a good portion of this money is programed to be spent to help the countries of Western Europe defray the costs of modernizing their own armies.

Based upon the administration's justifications, in excess of \$600 million is programed for this area of the world.

I cannot for the life of me understand why we should be asked to contribute more than \$600 million to help maintain armies in countries which are now more prosperous than they have ever been.

During the course of the Senate hearings on this bill, I asked Defense Secretary McElroy why more efforts were not being made to have the countries of Western Europe carry more of the burden.

I would like to read from that hearing: "Senator ELLENDER. I have only one question, Mr. Secretary. I am not going to go into any details of the programs in various countries.

"However, the record already made will show that I have expressed the belief that many of the countries receiving assistance from us should be helping us with the burden we are carrying rather than obtaining aid from us. Your statement indicates that efforts are being made to get these countries to do more, but, nevertheless, we continue to assist them.

"What recent efforts have been made to get these people to give more assistance to us?"

"Secretary McELROY. More assistance to themselves, I think, is the way I would say it. The things that have been going on include the purchasing of equipment by the Germans for the equipment of their forces.

"Senator ELLENDER. The Germans are well able to do that.

"Secretary McELROY. I agree, sir.

"Senator ELLENDER. In the past, however, we have given Germany vast sums of money which have contributed in no little way to her recovery.

"Secretary McELROY. That is right.

"Senator ELLENDER. I am just wondering why other countries in Western Europe are unable to do what the Germans are doing.

"Why is not more effort made to get them to assist us?"

"Secretary McELROY. I think your belief is that we are not doing as much as we should and I think you may be right, Senator.

"Senator ELLENDER. You mean in that direction?"

"Secretary McELROY. That is right.

"Senator ELLENDER. That is what I have been talking about. Your predecessor said he was going to do it. What are you doing now?"

"Secretary McELROY. I think conditions were less favorable during the time of my predecessor than they are now, sir. I think the financial position of the Western European countries has very considerably strengthened in the last 2 or 3 years.

"So I have far greater agreement now with your position on the strength of it than I think I could have had, say, 3 years ago.

"In my opinion, France is an example of a country where there must be considerably greater support of their military establishment, out of their own resources."

It is apparent from this testimony that even Secretary McElroy would like to have more help from the countries of Western Europe in preparing for their own defense.

Secretary McElroy cited France as an example of a country which must give greater support to its own military establishment.

Yet, do Senators know that France is programed to receive more than three times the amount of military assistance under the pending measure than she received during the last fiscal year?

What is more, this action is being taken in the face of France's request that we remove our airbases located there merely because we will not hand over our atomic weapons to General De Gaulle.

In other words, we are telling the French, "Kick us in the teeth when we are trying to help you defend your own country, and in return for this, we will treble the amount of money we give you."

If this is a precedent, then perhaps all of our other so-called allies will order American fighting men from their soil, just so they can receive increased grants under the military assistance program.

But above and beyond this, the high dollar balances and the vast gold reserves presently held by the countries of Western Europe should preclude the necessity of us furnishing aid to these countries, even if there are no other good and sufficient reason.

Mr. President, as I have previously stated, the dollar balances and gold reserves of the Western European countries will continue to increase during this fiscal year because of the dollars which will be spent by the underdeveloped countries as a result of grant economic assistance, and Development Loan Fund dollars received from us.

In addition, our own Defense Department will spend overseas in excess of \$3 billion in fiscal year 1960, and this entire amount will enter into the international balance of payments picture to further contribute to our alarming deficit balance of payments.

I have at my desk a table entitled, "U.S. Defense Expenditures Entering the International Balance of Payments," which shows how these dollars will go to the countries of Western Europe.

Unfortunately, this table has been labeled "secret" and I cannot make it available to the American public.

However, I invite Senators to come by my desk and look at these figures. They show only too well that, for the most part, these dollars are going to go directly into the pockets of those countries which have the least need for more American dollars.

I would also like to point out to Senators, that in addition to Western Europe, our former enemy Japan is in for a sizable portion of the military assistance appropriation. However, I am not able to give that exact figure since it has been labeled "secret." Suffice it to say that it is a large amount.

Mr. President, I am able to tell—it is not a secret—that Japan spends only between 1 and 2 percent of its gross national product for defense, as compared to our expenditure of 10.4 percent of our gross national product.

Augmenting the money we are spending in Western Europe and Japan through this military assistance program, and the spending there by our own Defense Department, there will be a large amount of private investment flowing into these very same countries.

For calendar year 1958, U.S. private investment overseas amounted to \$2.9 billion and the bulk of this amount was invested in Western Europe.

To further increase the dollar balances and the gold reserves of these countries, there are vast amounts of tourist dollars which will also be spent in these countries during the coming year.

For calendar year 1958, tourism resulted

in \$2.2 billion being spent in the countries of Western Europe alone.

In other words, Mr. President, as our national debt grows to new levels, and demands are made for the Federal Government to raise interest rates, our so-called allies are continuing to enjoy almost unlimited prosperity.

They are able to reduce their national debts and, in many cases, their taxes, while we are faced with the grave threat of a run on our dwindling gold reserve and, for the second successive year, a deficit balance of payments.

Mr. President, there are four ways in which U.S. dollars find their way into the pockets of the prosperous countries of Western Europe and Japan:

Through Defense Department spending to support our troops based in these countries, through private investment by U.S. citizens, through tourist spending, and finally through foreign aid.

I do not believe that any Senator feels that Congress should enact any type of restriction on the rights of individuals either to invest their money in a foreign country, or to visit a foreign country as a tourist.

Likewise, it is necessary for us to maintain our own armed services in foreign countries, and the resultant military spending must be continued, although I do believe that some reductions could be made in this field.

Through the process of elimination there is only one area where we can make a reduction in this outpouring of American dollars, and that area, Mr. President, is foreign aid, since this is the only field over which we can exercise any control.

As I have said many times in the past, we must mark a beginning of the end of foreign aid programs. This country cannot take the position that every year from now until eternity—or bankruptcy—we shall continue to spend some \$3 billion per year on aid to foreign countries.

In my judgment, a step in that direction would be a favorable vote on my motion to reduce military assistance spending for this fiscal year by \$100 million.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 107, pt. 2, pp. 2109-2113]

REPORT BY SENATOR ELLENDER ON U.S. FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President * * * In 1950, the dollar was truly "as good as gold." Today, the dollar's strength is showing signs of weakness; our gold balances continue to decline; and a substantial segment of international banking circles believes that the United States must either pull in its belt, or devalue the dollar, or both.

Not all of these difficulties can be traced to the foreign-aid program, but many of them can. By early 1951, as Europe's agricultural and industrial production began to exceed prewar averages, as the task of reconstruction ended—since the proposed goals had been reached—an area of unprecedented European growth began. U.S. economic assistance should have been tapered off then.

It will be recalled that in 1951 I made such a recommendation, but the logic of this view was ignored, because at the time the Korean war had begun.

With the Red onslaught in Korea came another and vastly different kind of threat. Where once, in the late 1940's, Soviet aggression against the free world had taken the form of subversion and efforts to gain control of political processes by quasi-legal means, the threat of the 1950's was armed aggression. At least, this was the official U.S. evaluation of the situation, and our European allies agreed.

America's planners, both economic and military, were not able or willing to adapt programs to the changes made necessary by world events. The concepts exemplified by the Marshall plan and NATO—concepts

which were, for a limited period, effective in Western Europe—were subsequently expanded to other areas of the globe.

Apparently it was believed—for the Congress was so informed—that the specter of “creeping communism” could be exorcised only through massive doses of economic aid to other countries, including the so-called underdeveloped countries, plus so-called collective security arrangements in areas other than NATO.

It should be remembered that at the time when these concepts were initially fostered, the United States was at war in Korea. World conditions of the moment required action; and, on representations of persons generally believed to be competent, the Congress acted quickly and forcefully.

It will be recalled that mine was one of the few voices lifted in opposition to these programs; but the cries of opponents were drowned out by the shouts of those in favor. As a result, America's aid burden grew.

The countries of Western Europe were kept on the United States aid list despite their achievement of full recovery; and America's treasure began to flow into a host of other areas. Economic and technical assistance agreements were negotiated with almost every country not behind the Iron Curtain; military assistance pacts were concluded with most of the same countries. Each pact bound the United States to defend the other contracting party, in case of attack; but few, if any, bound such other party to spring to our defense, in the event of an attack upon the United States.

In my inspections, one singularly amazing factor has consistently stood forth: the unwillingness of American administrators to tailor assistance—both military and non-military—to local conditions. This initial failure to adapt programs to meet the needs of a particular area has not been overcome during subsequent years of practical experience.

I have seen examples of this, time after time, year after year, in country after country.

Our failure generally to adapt to changing conditions has wreaked havoc with our NATO alliances. It will not, and cannot, be disputed that there are differences of opinion among the Western allies as to how best to deal with the Soviet Union. When these differences arise, American administrators, in order to procure the kind of program they feel necessary, are placed in the position of either obligating the total cost, or most of it, to the American taxpayers, or seeing their plans go by the board.

It is obvious that even where differences of opinion between the United States and the other Western allies are not so apparent our European allies are insistent upon “letting Uncle Sam do the work.” Witness Korea, where the overwhelming majority of foreign troops consisted of American forces, and where even now the United States is in full charge of the aid program, both military and economic. It is a truism that should Red forces obtain dominion over the Korean peninsula the security of the entire free world would be threatened—the security of the United Kingdom, France, Belgium, and other countries, as well as that of the United States. Yet at no time has the United States been able to prevail upon such other countries to effectively participate in the aid program in Korea.

The lessons of the past have apparently been wasted upon U.S. leadership, although there are hopeful signs that perhaps, at long last, the Department of State is learning that, in return for unstinting U.S. aid in the postwar years, our European neighbors are not above rewarding their benefactors with consummate ingratitude. I could not help but recall my first visit to Germany in 1946, shortly after World War II—the bombed-out buildings, the despair, the fear that before long what remained of German industry

would be Russian operated. Today, Germany is in the throes of an economic boom. The mark is rock solid, Germany's budget is in balance, and, compared with ours, her tax rates are most favorable. In spite of all this, the German Government only this past fall refused to help pay the costs of U.S. troops in Germany—present, I might add, to defend Germany against possible Red aggression—in order to help overcome the drain on American gold reserves.

At this point, I wish I could tell Senators, and other Americans in particular, what I found in Western Germany in respect to the assistance being rendered us by our so-called NATO allies. But I can say to any American father or mother who has a son tonight in Western Germany—that son would be in mortal danger, because of the lack of assistance to be given by our so-called allies if Russia were to attack—which I do not believe she will. I wish I could tell the public what I found. Somebody would want to use a shotgun or brickbat on somebody for permitting such a situation to exist as now exists. It is just shameful, Mr. President.

Far too long, the United States has turned the other cheek. Far too long, our leadership has submitted to demands on the part of Europe's leaders that all negotiations with the Soviet Union be cleared in advance with them. It is time for our Nation to recognize and insist that if the United States is going to carry the burdens of free world defense throughout the globe, then we are entitled to indulge in freedom of action vis-à-vis negotiations with the Soviet Union. On the other hand, if the leadership of Europe and other beneficiaries of U.S. largess are to insist upon exercising control over such elements as disarmament, et cetera, then they should be willing to pay the price by way of increased domestic defense costs, as well as larger volumes of assistance to underdeveloped lands.

It is my view now, as it has been my view of almost a decade, that unless immediate and basic changes are made in our foreign policy, both in theory and in execution, the United States stands in grave danger.

We certainly cannot carry the free world's load alone; to do so invites economic disaster and the destruction of the West's greatest bastion of economic strength. Further, the present situation, where the United States has become the arsenal for the free world—a development which has come because of the unwillingness of our allies to provide material for their own defense—would invite disaster should war come. Logistics alone—the movement of men, weapon, food, and fiber—to allied armies would pose almost impossible problems.

For these reasons, I recommended that greater emphasis be given to the United Nations; wherever possible, any action taken, military or economic, should be funneled through the United Nations, be it in the Congo, Laos, the Middle East, or any other area, with each nation bearing its fair, pro rata share of the cost. The United Nations, as an organ for preserving and maintaining the peace, must be strengthened. That the United Nations has a multitude of faults is obvious, but the United States must take the lead in eliminating these faults, without impairing U.S. sovereignty.

It has finally been driven home to the American people that neither our economy nor our fiscal resources are in the best of condition. “Balance of payments,” a term known only to economists a few short years ago, has become ominously familiar to the rank and file of our citizens.

In September 1959, in an address to the Senate in connection with debate on the mutual security appropriation bill, “I again pointed out that more dollars were leaving America than were coming in, that

these dollars were being converted into gold, and that our gold reserves were growing perilously low. I offered then, as I did in previous years, certain amendments which would have assisted in correcting this danger. While my amendments were shouted down, my remarks evidently caused some soul searching in the executive branch, because just a few months after my amendment of 1959, which would have required loan proceeds from the Development Loan Fund to be spent in the United States, was defeated, the Secretary of the Treasury endeavored to accomplish such a result by directive.

This matter of unfavorable balance of payments, is in my judgment, second only to the threat of domestic unemployment as the principal danger facing this country today.

When the deficit in our balance of payments approximated \$2.6 billion in 1950, there was little reason for concern. The once prosperous countries of Western Europe and Japan had little or no gold reserves and the amount of short-term dollars held by them was negligible, when compared to their current holdings.

Prior to, and immediately after, World War II, the United States was able to maintain its creditor position in world finances to compete effectively on world markets, because despite higher labor costs here, American production facilities were more modern than those of our competitors, American technology was generally superior and, through the miracle of mass production, American goods were of a higher quality for the price paid.

With the advent of the Marshall plan, the United States began to share the fruits of its technology with other countries—to rebuild their devastated industrial complexes—to further reduce tariff barriers to permit the recipients of our aid to earn dollars, in order, we are told, to become better customers of the United States.

Unfortunately, the United States extracted no concessions in return for this aid, relying instead upon the theory that the countries of Western Europe, once restored to economic health, would “do unto Uncle Sam as Uncle Sam had done unto them.”

That was the view of Mr. Paul Hoffman, the first Administrator of this program, when it was known as the European Cooperation Administration. He said, “Make Europe prosperous—the Europeans will buy more from us.”

I shall not go into the details as to what is happening now, because everybody knows about it. Europe today is as prosperous, if not more prosperous than, it has ever been. Europe today is one of our chief competitors in world trade and is taking away from us millions of dollars worth of exports which we enjoyed in previous years.

This theory proved woefully false, and now we find ourselves in dire financial straits because of a decade of deficits in our balance of payments.

In this time of crisis, more than lip-service is necessary to solve the balance of payments dilemma. Our Government must take immediate steps to the end that the problem can be solved today—not tomorrow. There is not a good, sound, or sufficient reason for us to delay.

Therefore, I believe that the following actions should be taken immediately:

First. Military grant assistance to the dollar surplus countries of Western Europe and Japan should be entirely eliminated and replaced by a military equipment sales program.

As I pointed out last year to the Senate, Western Europe is prosperous. When I say Western Europe I do not include Greece and Turkey, but only the countries of Western Europe from Italy westward. In this bill passed by the Senate last year there was \$750 million of borrowed money made available to

the countries of Western Europe, to buy equipment and aid them in their defenses.

As I pointed out in this report, many countries which are still receiving aid from us are spending from 3 to 4 percent of their gross national product on defense, as compared to the 11 percent we are spending of our gross national product for this purpose. One country, in particular, is spending less than 3 percent of its gross national product on defense. Unfortunately, these figures have been classified as secret.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, some of the countries to which we give assistance are better able than we to carry the burden which now faces us.

Second, All moneys appropriated to the Development Loan Fund and the International Cooperation Administration should be spent in the United States, without exception, unless it should be completely impractical.

Third, A study should be initiated immediately to determine the feasibility of reducing the manpower that the United States has deployed in NATO Europe, as well as in other parts of the world. Our NATO obligations should be reevaluated, to the end that each member nation will share its just proportion of military equipment and manpower.

Mr. President, I repeat: I wish I could tell the American people what I found in these NATO countries of Western Europe. It is shameful the way some countries have withdrawn their manpower from the joint effort and how they have failed to provide needed equipment.

Fourth, There should be imposed immediately tight restrictions on all off-shore procurement carried on by the International Cooperation Administration, the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Bureau of Reclamation, the General Services Administration, and all other agencies engaged in extensive buying from the hard currency countries.

Fifth, The disbursements of funds to promote travel of American tourists abroad should cease immediately, if it has not already been accomplished. Although I am not opposed to American tourism, I believe the dollars expended could be used to better advantage by promoting the travel of foreigners to America, in view of the alarming deficit in our balance of payments.

In any assessment of our foreign operations, we should not overlook the fact that as of today, notwithstanding the expenditure of over \$86 billion, there has been a steady decline in our position as world leader. Our prestige has suffered immeasurably. During this same period Russia has gained new strength and is threatening to replace us in our position of world leadership.

When any attempt is made to assess what our future relationships with the Soviet bloc may hold, or what courses we should chart, it must be kept in mind that no longer do the Soviet Union and the United States alone stand preeminent in world affairs. The rubble of Western Europe and Japan has been transformed into a viable economic third force. The world's political atmosphere, only a decade ago consisting of a choice between Stalinist communism and American freedom, has been supplemented by an upsurge of such age-old philosophies as neutralism and nationalism, plus the virulence of the Red Chinese brand of totalitarianism.

Although once the Soviet Union and the United States offered two clear-cut and clear choices around which world sentiment and opinion could polarize, other energies have now entered the magnetic field of international relationships. Because of this, and for other reasons it is obvious that policies formulated in 1946, or even 1956 or 1959, are no longer necessarily valid today.

But the necessary changes have not been made.

It has not been my privilege to travel to many places in the world; but through my acquaintanceship with persons who have been privileged to travel on official missions, or otherwise, I know that many of the details which the Senator from Louisiana has reported have been confirmed on many occasions.

I think it is about time that we seek to interest people to take these reports under active consideration and, in one way or another, to do something about them. The statement made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] are indeed well deserved. I hope the report, large as it may seem, will not appear forbidding to those who examine it and see the careful detail with which the Senator has prepared it.

I for one commend the Senator from Louisiana for his detailed reports—not only this one, but also the others he has made—because I have found them to be most interesting and profitable in my own investigations on many occasions.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the Senator from Louisiana for making, once again, a report on the results of his travels overseas. In my opinion, no one works more seriously at the job of looking after the Nation's foreign affairs, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, than does the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana.

I assure him that I did not know he intended to make his report today until I returned to the States last night. I have not had a chance to examine the report, but the Senator may be certain that, as always, I shall read with great interest what he has said. I also express to him my appreciation for the time and energy he has expended in compiling the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll?

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, ever since the goals of the Marshall plan were achieved, I have stated that the vast expenditures for foreign aid were going to drain our stock of gold. That has now come to pass.

As all of us know, the foreign aid program has been in existence for two decades and there seems to be no end. The President sends us a cash budget request of \$3.4 billion for foreign aid and he says this is barebones; that we have never spent less in foreign aid. That is what he also said to us last year. But if one looks at the record, he finds that, in addition to the cash budget he sent up here last year, and the year before, we spent \$1.750 billion in furnishing food to many of our friends. Mr. President, you do not buy food with collar buttons; you need cash for it.

Another thing is that we have been continuing to assist in furnishing the major part of the money to operate many of the international banks that were organized during the last 16 years. We have furnished the major part of the capital

requirement in almost every instance. If one adds all the funds, we have furnished for foreign aid, that is, the amount that we have spent by way of food, aid; the sum made available for military and economic aid, and the capital supplied international banks, he will see that the foreign aid program today is as big as when we started 20 years ago.

NEXT STEPS FOR A BETTER ENVIRONMENT—ADDRESS BY IRA N. GABRIELSON

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the one annual conservation meeting that occupies the attention of natural resources specialists from the United States, Canada, Mexico, and other countries is the North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference. The 33d conference opened Monday in Houston, Tex., with more than 1,200 of North America's natural resources administrators, technicians, and conservation leaders in attendance.

Each year the conference program emphasizes broad matters of conservation interest to all Americans. The theme of this year's meeting is "Balancing Future Resource Uses," and delegates are discussing the actions that are needed to assure the continued availability of the resources so necessary for our national well-being.

Conservationists know that our future national welfare will depend heavily on the restoration and the proper use of our waters, forests, soil, wildlife, and other manageable or renewable resources. We share a responsibility to replenish these resources so they will be available to future generations. Use of these resources also must be accomplished in such a way as not to disfigure or defile the environment if America is to remain a pleasant place in which to live.

Some of the dimensions of the threat to our environment were outlined by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute. The thoughts of one of the deans of the American conservation movement are always of interest and importance to us all.

Environmental problems, Dr. Gabrielson points out, have been and are being created because—

An expanding population requires more space for homes and businesses and service facilities of all kinds. These installations seldom add to natural resources productivity, and their impact upon the environment oftentimes is harsh. A host of technical products, like pesticides and fertilizers, are being strewn widely across the land with little understanding of their ultimate effects. And finally, some of our most critical resources and environments are being degraded by the awesome outpouring of society's wastes. All outdoors is a disposal system. We are using and abusing the foundation of our national strength at a prodigious rate.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson's remarks be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEXT STEPS FOR BETTER ENVIRONMENT

(Presented by Ira N. Gabrielson, president, Wildlife Management Institute, at the 33d North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, Houston, Tex., March 11, 1968)

Many of the things that can be done to create a better environment and to maintain good environments where they still exist should be obvious to anyone who is engaged in natural resources activity. Every day, over my desk and yours, there is a parade of papers describing actions that could be taken and reasons why changes should be made.

The suggestions flow from the knowledge that North America is beset with surging social, political, and economic currents. Population is increasing rapidly. People are leaving the countryside and are concentrating in already impacted metropolitan complexes. Industry and supportive science and technology are flourishing.

An expanding population requires more space for homes and businesses and service facilities of all kinds. These installations seldom add to natural resources productivity, and their impact upon the environment oftentimes is harsh. A host of technical products, like pesticides and fertilizers, are being strewn widely across the land with little understanding of their ultimate effects. And finally, some of our most critical resources and environments are being degraded by the awesome outpouring of society's wastes. All outdoors is a disposal system. We are using and abusing the foundation of our national strength at a prodigious rate.

Through neglect and indifference, by inaction and lack of understanding, society is engaged in needless natural resources brinkmanship. Without corrective action, without responsive programs, policies, and organizational alignments, and without a determined awareness from the individual up through every level of government, society has the capacity to commit natural resources to frivolous and wasteful purposes. Resources of vast value are being diminished, and some already may have been destroyed.

If this sounds extreme, then I recommend that you study the proceedings of the Lake Michigan Water Pollution Conference, held only a few weeks ago. No natural resources professional can read that meeting record without reaching the conclusion that this concern about the environment is fact, not fiction.

There will be an unavoidable conclusion, too, that technical knowledge in itself offers no protection against environmental disasters. Only when properly applied is knowledge effective. Its application takes more than laws, or appropriations, or sympathetic understanding and good intentions. It takes all this and more. Mostly, it takes a determined people, a people who refuse to accept delays and excuses as substitutes for action. No one, no agency, no single unit of government can protect and improve the environment. It requires the diligent attention of every segment of society.

That is what the professional's concern for the environment is all about. The environment is not limited to trees and natural beauty, or wilderness and wildlife refuges, or parks, playgrounds, and air and water pollution. These are parts of the environment just as clean water, fertile and uncontaminated soils, and smog-free air are parts of the whole. Give balanced consideration to all of these facets within the framework of their setting and the environment can be improved and protected.

Several obstacles block progress toward balanced, effective action. Most of them can be traced to government, because it is through the laws and ordinances of government that action essentially is put into motion.

Foremost of these obstacles is govern-

ment's traditional habit of acting retroactively rather than prospectively to resources and environmental problems. Government looks more to the past and the present than it does to the future. The national water pollution control program, for example, is geared more to what occurred yesterday than to what is going to happen tomorrow. We are more occupied with trying to clean up what has been left behind than in preventing its proliferation in the future.

A second and related obstacle is the failure to take policy positions promptly. Policy is forced upon us by circumstances rather than by opportunities. Even now, at this late date, only fragmented policy shields our landscape from the persistent chemicals that are showered upon it. Government also is unable to face up to a policy declaration that the best way to keep water from becoming polluted is to keep contaminants out of it in the first place.

In another area, in outdoor recreation, Congress enacted the Land and Water Conservation Fund program to accelerate the acquisition of state and federal recreational lands. But having taken that desirable step, the Congress is reluctant to take the position that the limited federal share of the Fund should augment existing federal recreational programs, rather than supplant them. By failing to take a positive stand, Congress has shifted the whole burden of federal outdoor recreation to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and you know the chaotic result. Current proposals to expand the financial base of this program may help for a while, but money alone will not resolve the program's dilemma. Correction calls for more money and for program re-direction.

Another policy breakdown is the failure to specify what the state shares of the Land and Water Conservation Fund are to be used for. Conservationists believe that the Fund's primary purpose is to spur acquisition, to secure suitable land for outdoor recreation before competing uses and rising costs drive it from the market place. But that high ideal is not being achieved. Development has taken 61 percent of the money shared with the states since the start of the Fund program. Development adds little to our recreational estate on a long-term basis.

Still another obstacle to improving the environment is the on-again, off-again method of financing essential programs. Resources activities are the first to be cut when there is a budget reduction and the last to benefit when money is available. A further complication is the way that appropriations shift in response to the axiom that doing a little about a lot has more political appeal than doing fewer things well.

Funds needed for basic resources protection programs, as for air and water pollution prevention or public land management, should be isolated from the popularity contests of day-to-day government. The expense of doing these necessary things should be regarded as investments, rather than costs of government. Distinction also should be made between necessary resources programs and the mechanistic resources approaches of the federal construction agencies.

A final, serious obstacle, in my opinion, is the reluctance to apply the knowledge we already possess to the immediate problems of improving and protecting the environment. Wait for new technology, for more efficient and less expensive methods, our opponents and the uninformed say. Plan and study more, they ask. But cite one example of a basic resources program of which I speak where delay has reduced investment costs or has yielded more positive results. There is none. Historically, delay always has resulted in smaller gains and larger costs.

Against this background, I want to comment on some contemporary problems that are endangered by program and policy inde-

cision and by inadequate appropriations support. There has been much justifiable concern in recent months about the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. The program lost momentum, and its personnel was badly divided and confused. Conflict flared within the present organization, the Department of the Interior, and within the pollution control agency itself. A new Assistant Secretary of the Interior has been appointed, a man highly regarded by those of us who have worked with him in the past. A new program commissioner also has been named, a man from Texas, known for his outspoken criticism of the federal program. That may be good or bad, and only time will tell.

An indication that the water pollution control program may be over-coming some of its difficulties is the recent Interior Department news release headed "Water Quality Degradation Issue Resolved." Early failure to develop policy in this crucial area has been one of the foremost hangups in the water pollution control program. I am glad this action finally has been taken, but whether the degradation issue actually has been resolved, as the news release says, is yet to be seen. Riding on its outcome is whether existing high-quality waters are to be degraded under the administration of the water standards program.

The oil shale situation is another example of government dealing retroactively with resources, waiting until problems become unbearable rather than attempting to anticipate and resolve them while they are minor. Persons interested in recreation and the out-of-doors should be concerned about what will happen to the millions of acres of oil shale lands that are in public ownership if surface mining is permitted. Everyone also has reason to seek assurance that the public will receive a fair return for the untold value these lands contain. And there is urgent reason to demand that the mining and extraction of oil shale does not denude the countryside and pollute streams and air, making conditions intolerable for man as well as everything else.

Another policy dilemma is presented by the old congressional directive in the 1916 National Park Service Act giving it the mission to "conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for future generations." How these two diametrical purposes can be accomplished other than under a priority mandate for the preservation of nature in the parks, I do not know. The history of civilization leaves no doubt that increased human use and occupancy alter the environment.

The demands on our national parks for more roads and more accommodations of all kinds are at an unprecedented high. But that really is nothing new. It can be said every year and still be true. Park pressures increase with population expansion. There ultimately will be no nature for people to enjoy in national parks, if the parks are destined always to be cut up with roads and developed in response to unthinking demands. The time has come in some of our national parks to draw the line, firmly and without hesitation, and to make the most fundamental decisions that will restrict development and use of the parks to the carrying capacity of their natural environment. This does not necessarily mean that visitation must be reduced. Rather, it means that the point has been reached where many parks can tolerate no more roads or over-night developments. New transportation methods and regional recreational planning and development must be undertaken promptly.

The important work of the Public Land Law Review Commission continues. The

Commission has received more money for its study, and its reporting date has been extended by 18 months to June 30, 1970. Conservationists should follow the Commission's work closely so as to be prepared for the many developments that are sure to follow the submission of its report.

The program of the Bureau of Land Management to classify public lands for either retention or disposal under the Classification and Multiple Use Act is not popular with some western political and commercial interests. They seek broader personal and corporate privileges on the public lands. The Western Governors Conference has called for the program's termination. The chairman of the Public Land Law Review Commission has questioned its advisability. As you may know, the Commission chairman also heads the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. That Committee saw an opportunity last year to derail the program when it handled legislation to extend the Commission's life. Congress had geared the Classification and Multiple Use Act to expire when the work of the Public Land Law Review Commission was completed. In extending the life of the Commission, however, the House made no mention of the Classification and Multiple Use Act. This would have terminated the public lands classification work well before the Commission's work was done. The Senate recognized this serious flaw, and the necessary correction was made.

The vital land-classification program now has the legal basis for continuing. But another attempt may be made to kill it by deleting funds from the Bureau of Land Management's budget for the new fiscal year. If that attempt is made, and there are strong reasons to believe that it will, conservationists should be prepared to insist that BLM is given the money it needs. Classification is a necessary first step to improved management of the public domain.

The Bureau of Land Management's program is under fire in other ways. Range users and stockmen's associations recently forced a delay in implementing new regulations for nearly 16 million acres of public lands, the so-called Section 15 lands of the Taylor Grazing Act. The current regulations governing those lands remain substantially unchanged from the time they were written three decades ago. The new regulations would give priority to permittees who agree to provide public access to the land the public owns. There is no such provision at present, and as all of you westerners know, large acreages of public lands are off-limits to the people who own them. The Department of the Interior was obliged to appoint a committee to study the communications it had received in response to the call for public comments on the proposed regulations. That study will be completed early this spring, and conservationists should be prepared to insist that the regulations are adopted without additional delay.

In these remarks I have touched on some of the principal issues which confront all persons interested in improving and maintaining the environment. I have not said anything directly about the federal budget situation, because there is little to report other than the fact that there will be much more belt tightening if the war in Vietnam is not resolved soon. In water pollution control and in other vital programs, appropriations will be considerably below authorized levels. In light of the overall federal fiscal situation, there is little that can be done this year to increase any of these appropriations items. In fact, we must guard against further cuts by Congress and the impoundment of appropriated funds by the executive agencies.

These are some of the things that I believe are important to the improvement and protection of our environment. All conservationists have a strong responsibility to promote

the viewpoint that there is nothing negative about protecting environment. Environmental protection does not stifle progress; it merely provides the guidelines and the emphasis which are so badly needed for our American way of life.

INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR PROVIDES REAL OPPORTUNITY TO HONOR PRESENT GENERATION AND DEVELOP CONCEPT OF RESPECT AND PROTECTION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, it is my genuine hope that 1968—the International Human Rights Year—will provide the momentum to gain Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Genocide, Freedom of Association, Political Rights of Women, and Forced Labor.

Human rights, I feel, are based completely on mankind's continuing search for a normal, decent, civilized life. Every human being deserves respect and protection of his inherent dignity.

I feel quite strongly that 1968 is the time to be practical and, as President Woodrow Wilson once said:

Strive to work toward becoming one of the greatest schools of civilization.

We can head toward that direction by no longer turning our backs on the issues of our times and giving approval now to the treaties offered the Senate years ago.

Our international responsibility, I feel, compels Senate ratification.

The United States must unequivocally state that human rights are not simply a matter of State law or Federal statute. Human rights are inherent and cannot be alternately granted and grabbed at some despot's whim.

I urge the Senate to ratify the Human Rights Conventions on Genocide, Freedom of Association, Political Rights of Women, and Forced Labor.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY PROLONGS THE WAR

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the past weekend was the occasion of an anniversary other than the one honoring St. Patrick, so I thought I should take a few minutes today to point to another anniversary which is of great significance to our country.

Saturday, March 16, marked the first anniversary of the ratification of the Consular Treaty with the Soviet Union by the U.S. Senate. I think it is worthy of note that the Soviet Union has failed to ratify the treaty during this entire year. It may be recalled that during the debate on the treaty last year, several of us attempted to point out that in all probability the Soviet Union would not ratify the treaty with any punctuality whatever.

The administration made great claims as to the growing détente between our country and the U.S.S.R. and called for the ratification of the treaty as a means of improving relations between our two countries. This was in spite of the fact that there were no surface indications of a détente atmosphere by the Soviet Union.

Besides the unwillingness of the Soviet Union to ratify the treaty, what other steps toward friendlier relations has the Soviet Union undertaken during the past year? They have greatly stepped up their military and economic aid to North Vietnam. According to press reports on preliminary Pentagon estimates, aid to Hanoi from her Communist brethren increased by about 1 billion since we signed the Consular Treaty.

The emphasis, according to information received in Washington, in the increased aid has been on air defense items. These include surface-to-air—SAM—missiles, antiaircraft artillery, radar, fighter planes, and ammunition. Vast quantities of ammunition have been aimed at U.S. planes. Several thousand SAM's were reported fired at American aircraft during 1967—during the year of the great détente.

More than 250 Russian-provided SAM missile systems are now in operation in North Vietnam, for which the Russians have supplied well over 4,000 missiles. In addition, the Soviet Union has provided the North Vietnamese well over 8,000 antiaircraft weapons, many of which are radar controlled. They are highly sophisticated weapons and are responsible for the deadly accuracy of the enemy and the death of many American airmen. The Soviet Union has installed in the neighborhood of 300 radar units.

But the Soviet material of war is not limited to antiaircraft weapons only. The Soviets have provided many other sophisticated weapons, such as amphibious tanks, self-propelled guns, and so forth.

In spite of this, the U.S. Government still follows a bridge-building policy when it has been amply demonstrated that the bridges, so far as the Soviet Union is concerned, will be one-way streets—usually leading to well-filled American military cemeteries. A major factor in the administration's bridge-building plans has been the expansion of East-West trade.

During the Consular Treaty debate last year, on March 10, I placed in the Record the so-called sanitized version of the 400-plus items which had been removed from the strategic control list by the Department of Commerce on October 12, 1966, in compliance with a request which President Johnson made on October 7, 1966.

As I said at that time, this was a gesture of appeasement toward the Communist countries actively supporting an army, the North Vietnamese who were fighting American boys in Vietnam. The action was wrong in 1966; it was wrong in March of 1967; and it is wrong today. Yet it continues. I believe it can be proved with all certainty that that action—that trade, that supplying of weapons to the enemy—has helped to prolong the war in Vietnam and is one of the reasons why we are now compelled to send additional troops to that conflict. It has tremendously helped to provide the North Vietnamese with the weapons they need to escalate the fighting to kill additional American boys, and it has certainly fed the stubborn refusal of Ho Chi Minh to come to the negotiating table to work out a civilized peace.

Apart from these 400-plus items which were decontrolled by the President, as mentioned in his address before the National Association of Editorial Writers on October 7, 1967, of far more significance to the Communist bloc countries has been the adoption of a more permissive review of those 1,900 categories of items still under export control as strategic materials. But as Sherman Abrahamson, Deputy Director, Office of Export Control, revealed before the East-West trade briefing session at AMA headquarters on March 5, 1968, only 2 percent of the applications for the export of strategic materials are currently rejected.

Included among the shipments to the Communist countries which have been specifically approved, from these 1,900 permissive items are items such as the Worden gravity meter, diethylene glycol, an ingredient used in the manufacture of explosives and liquid rocket propellants.

Diethylene glycol can also be used as a plasticizer in solid rocket propellants of the type suitable for air-to-air missiles like the ones mentioned previously as being supplied by the Soviet Union to the North Vietnamese for killing American troops.

Mr. President, I could mention many more items on this list of 1,900 categories still considered strategic but nevertheless still being shipped to the Communists, but these sales can be found documented in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 113, part 14, beginning on page 18761.

So, Mr. President, as we observe this anniversary of the ratification of the Consular Treaty and attempt to assess the success of the administration's bridgebuilding program, and this strange new and unprecedented concept of trading with the enemy in time of war, however we look at that and see the ramifications illustrated from our ratification of the treaty, I believe further thought should be given to this indefensible policy of trading with the Soviet Union in light of the increased aid supplied by that country to North Vietnam.

Mr. President, as I call attention to the fact that last year the Consular Treaty was approved by the narrow margin of only three votes, and also as a reminder of this ill-conceived policy, I ask unanimous consent that the 400 items contained in Current Export Bulletin No. 941, dated October 12, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bulletin

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE, OFFICE OF EXPORT CONTROL,
Washington, D.C., October 18, 1966.
To: All field offices; all customs offices.
From: Mrs. Geraldine S. DePuy, Director, Operations Division.
Subject: Current Export Bulletin No. 941, dated October 12, 1966.

Current Export Bulletin No. 941 revised the Commodity Control List in many different respects, including the decontrol action for exports to Eastern European communist countries (Country Group Y). However, the Eastern European communist countries decontrol created a great deal of public interest in view of its relationship to the President's speech of October 7.

Attached is the following information which should be helpful in answering questions regarding the Eastern European communist countries decontrol action:

Exhibit No. 1: Analysis of the Decontrol Action for Exports to Eastern European Communist Countries.

Exhibit No. 2: Commodities Decontrolled for Exports to Eastern European Communist Countries *Including* East Germany.

Exhibit No. 3: Commodities Decontrolled for Exports to Eastern European Communist Countries *Excluding* East Germany. (Attachments.)

EXHIBIT 1

ANALYSIS OF THE DECONTROL ACTION FOR EXPORTS TO EASTERN EUROPEAN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Current Export Bulletin No. 941, dated October 12, 1966, announced a decontrol action for United States exports to Eastern European Communist countries. This action was taken to implement the President's speech of October 7, in which he stated in part: "We will reduce export controls on East-West with respect to hundreds of non-strategic items."

A proper evaluation of the decontrol action requires an examination into two aspects:

(1) What countries were affected by the decontrol action?

(2) What commodities were decontrolled for each of the affected countries?

COUNTRIES AFFECTED

The form of the decontrol action announced decontrols for two country groupings:

(1) Exports to *all* Eastern European Communist countries and

(2) Exports to all such countries *except* East Germany.

As used in the announcement, the term "Eastern European Communist countries" comprises: Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany (Soviet Zone of Germany and the Soviet Sector of Berlin), Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Outer Mongolia, and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The

Export Regulations refer to these Eastern European Communist countries as "Country Group Y."

CLASSES OF COMMODITIES DECONTROLLED

As indicated below, only ten commodity items spread over six commodity classes were decontrolled for exports to East Germany. The bulk of the decontrol action centered on the decontrol of commodities for export to Eastern European Communist countries *other than* East Germany. The affected commodity classes and the extent of decontrol for each commodity class is shown below.

NUMBER OF COMMODITY ITEMS DECONTROLLED BY COMMODITY CLASS AND COUNTRY GROUPING

| Commodity class | All Eastern European Communist countries | Eastern European Communist countries except East Germany |
|--|--|--|
| Food: | | |
| Cereals and cereal preparations..... | 2 | 1 |
| Fruits and vegetables..... | 1 | — |
| Sugar and sugar preparations..... | — | 2 |
| Feeding stuff for animals..... | 3 | — |
| Miscellaneous food preparations..... | 2 | 1 |
| Crude materials, inedible: | | |
| Leather scrap..... | — | 1 |
| Crude rubber..... | — | 2 |
| Textile fibers..... | — | 20 |
| Metal scrap..... | — | 4 |
| Crude animal material..... | — | 1 |
| Mineral fuels, lubricants, and related materials: | | |
| Petroleum and petroleum products..... | — | 6 |
| Gas, natural and manufactured..... | — | 2 |
| Chemicals: | | |
| Chemical elements and compounds..... | 1 | 23 |
| Crude chemicals from coal and petroleum..... | — | 2 |
| Dyeing, tanning, and coloring material..... | — | 7 |
| Medicinal and pharmaceutical products..... | — | 6 |
| Polishing and cleansing preparations..... | — | 3 |
| Fertilizers..... | — | 1 |
| Nonmilitary pyrotechnical articles..... | — | 1 |
| Cellulose and artificial resins..... | — | 4 |
| Chemical materials and products, n.e.c..... | — | 15 |
| Manufactured goods: | | |
| Rubber manufactures..... | — | 5 |
| Wood and cork manufactures..... | — | 6 |
| Paper, paperboard, and manufactures thereof..... | — | 5 |
| Textile yarn fabrics..... | — | 44 |
| Nonmetallic mineral manufactures..... | — | 14 |
| Nonferrous metals manufactures..... | — | 1 |
| Manufactures of metals, n.e.c..... | 1 | 27 |
| Heating and lighting fixtures..... | — | 3 |
| Furniture..... | — | 2 |
| Travel goods and handbags..... | — | 1 |
| Clothing and accessories..... | — | 23 |
| Footwear..... | — | 1 |
| Professional, scientific, and controlling instruments; photographic and optical goods, and watches and clocks..... | — | 13 |
| Miscellaneous manufactured articles, n.e.c..... | — | 18 |
| Coin, other than gold coin, not being legal tender..... | — | 1 |
| Machinery and transport equipment: | | |
| Machinery, other than electric..... | — | 41 |
| Electrical apparatus and appliances..... | — | 14 |
| Transport equipment..... | — | 5 |

EXHIBIT 2

COMMODITIES DECONTROLLED FOR EXPORTS TO EASTERN EUROPEAN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES, INCLUDING EAST GERMANY

| Export control commodity No. | Commodity description |
|------------------------------|--|
| 04811 | Breakfast cereals prepared for cooking. |
| 04812 | Breakfast cereals prepared for serving. |
| 05420 | Beans, peas, and other leguminous vegetables, dried. |
| 08110 | Other vegetable products for animal feed, n.e.c. |
| 08195 | Other food wastes, n.e.c. |
| 08199 | Other prepared animal feed, including feather meal and alfalfa meal. |
| 09100 | Margarine; and shortening. |
| 09910 | Canned hominy; corn chips and similar chips and sticks; and other grain food preparations and dairy food preparations. |
| 51206 | Soil conditioners. |
| 69524 | Drill bits, core bits, and reamers, under 4 inches o.d., containing diamonds. |

EXHIBIT 3

COMMODITIES DECONTROLLED FOR EXPORTS TO EASTERN EUROPEAN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES, EXCLUDING EAST GERMANY

| Export control commodity No. | Commodity description |
|------------------------------|--|
| 04840 | Other bakery products. |
| 06130 | Sugar, beet and cane, raw or refined. |
| 06180 | Sugar, invert, liquid, and powdered; lactose, crude and refined; malt sugar (maltose); maple sugar; refined milk sugar; and crude sugar of milk. (Report medicinal grades of malt sugar (maltose) in export control commodity No. 51203.) |
| 06201 | Sugar-coated cereal foods and candied or sweetened popped corn. |
| 09904 | Mayonnaise; and other salad dressings. Grain food preparations and dairy food preparations. |
| 21180 | Leather scrap and chrome shavings for fertilizer manufacture. |
| 23110 | Compounds of natural rubber, balata, gutta parcha and other allied gums. |
| 23120 | Neoprene (polymers of chloroprene). |
| 26201 | Recovered fibers, noils, and waste, n.e.c., wholly or in chief weight wool. |
| 26230 | Mohair and other wool-like specialty hair. |
| 26240 | Sheep's and lamb's wool, not carded or combed. |
| 26270 | Wool or other animal hair, carded or combed, excluding tops. |
| 26280 | Tops of wool and other animal hair, except horsehair. |
| 264 | Jute, including jute cuttings and waste. |
| 26500 | Vegetable fibers and waste of sisal, henequen, manila or abaca. |
| 26621 | Other manmade staple fibers, noncellulosic, not carded or combed. |
| 26622 | Other continuous filament tow, noncellulosic. |
| 26623 | Manmade fibers or waste, noncellulosic, carded or combed or otherwise processed but not spun. |
| 26631 | Acetate or rayon (viscose and cuprammonium) staple, not carded or combed. |
| 26632 | Acetate or rayon (viscose and cuprammonium) continuous filament tow. |
| 26633 | Other manmade fibers or waste, cellulosic, carded or combed or otherwise processed but not spun. |
| 26640 | Waste of other manmade fibers, not carded or combed. |
| 26700 | Other used civilian clothing, used textile articles, n.e.c., and new or used rags. |
| 27420 | Iron pyrites, unroasted. |
| 27621 | Mullite grains and pellets. |
| 27640 | Asbestos, unmanufactured. |
| 27655 | Natural cryolite; and natural chiolite. |
| 27698 | Arsenic bisulfide, natural; arsenic sulfide, natural; calcium silicate; kieserite, natural; magnesium chloride, natural, anhydrous; magnesium sulphate, natural sodium sulphate, natural; soil; strontianite; strontium carbonate; and trona. |
| 28100 | Iron ore mass. |
| 28200 | Terne-plated scrap; and tin-plated scrap which has not been detinned. |
| 28404 | Other aluminum alloy waste and scrap. |
| 28405 | Other magnesium or magnesium alloy waste and scrap. |
| 29100 | Biological supplies, animal origin; glands, crude; hoof meal; and pancreas. |
| 33262 | Paraffin wax, crystalline. |
| 33291 | Other nonlubricating and nonfuel petroleum oils (bbl. of 42 gal.). |
| 33292 | Pitch of tar coke. |
| 33293 | Pitch coke. |
| 33295 | Petroleum bitumen and other petroleum and shale oil residues. |
| 33296 | Bituminous mixtures, based on asphalt, petroleum, etc. |
| 34110 | Natural gas liquids, including liquefied petroleum gas (L.P.G.) (bbl. of 42 gals.). |
| 34120 | Gas, manufactured (artificial). |
| 51202 | Ortho-aminonitro-benzene; para-hydroxy-chlorobenzene; and paratoluenesulfonylchloride. (18) |
| 51202 | Paradow. (16) |
| 51203 | Methionine hydroxy analogue. |
| 51204 | 6, ethoxy-1,2 dihydro-2,2,4-trimethyl-quinoline. |
| 51205 | Methyl stearate; and triethyl phosphate. |
| 51206 | Sodium pentachlorophenol; 2,3-dichloroallyl diisopropylthiocarbamate; and 2,3,3-trichloroallyl diisopropylthiocarbamate. |
| 51207 | Nerol and phynyl nerol. |
| 51207 | Other chemicals for flavor and perfumery use, natural origin. |
| 51207 | Other enzymes. |
| 51208 | Cadmium salicylate. |
| 51209 | Organic chemicals, the following only: A, B-dibromopropionic acid; adenylic acid; camphoric acid; campho-sulfuric acid; corn protein denaturant; crotonaldehyde; cyana-cetamide; diacetone alcohol; diethyl malonate; dimethyl glyoxime; dipentaerythritol acetate, dipentaerythritol hexapropionate; dipentaerythritol hexylbutyrate; ethyl alcohol, ethyl butyrate; ethyl chloride; ethyl chloroacetate; ethyl chloro-carbonate; ethyl formate; ethyl hydrogen sulfate; ethyl lactate; ethyl malonate; ethyl mercaptan; glutaronitrile; glyceryl monostearate; methyl glutamate; methyl hydroxy acetate (methyl glycolate); methylvinylacetate; monoisopropanolamine; monopentaerythritol diacetate dinutyrate; monopentaerythritol tetrabutylate; pentanedione 2-4 (acetylacetone); and perpinylacetate. |
| 51209 | Miscellaneous organic chemicals, excluding cyclic, n.e.c., the following only: aluminum acetate, aluminum dihydroxyaminoacetate aluminum formate solutions; aluminum isopropylate; aluminum lactate; aluminum octoate; aluminum oxiquinolate; ammonium acetate; ammonium bitartrate; ammonium ferric oxalate; ammonium oxalate; ammonium thio-glycolate; antimony lactate; cadmium acetate; cadmium octoate; calcium acetate; calcium formate; calcium linoleate, except paint and varnish driers; calcium tartrate; chlorophyll; dry; chlorophyll solution (in oil); iron protoxalate; iron sodium oxalate; magnesium acetate; magnesium oxphenyl arsenate; manganese acetate; potassium acetate; potassium bitartrate; potassium oxalate; potassium oxichinolin sulfonate; potassium salicylate; sodium allyl arsenate; sodium bitartrate (acid sodium tartrate); sodium formate; sodium gluconate; sodium methylate; sodium oxalate; sodium potassium tartrate; sodium salicylate; sodium stearate; tartar emetic; zinc acetate; and zinc stearate. |
| 51329 | Arsenic powder; pyrographite (deposited carbon); and iodine U.S.P. (resublimed). |
| 51333 | Sulfuric acid; and oleum. |
| 51338 | Hydrochloric or muriatic acid. |
| 51350 | Iron hydroxide; zinc hydroxide; and zinc peroxide. |
| 51361 | Ammonia, anhydrous or in aqueous solution. |
| 51362 | Sodium hydroxide (caustic soda), solid and liquid. |
| 51363 | Potassium hydroxide; potassium peroxide; and sodium peroxide. |
| 51368 | Tin oxides. |
| 51440 | Other inorganic pigments, n.e.c. |
| 51460 | Sodium compounds and potassium compounds, the following only: potash-magnesia carbonate; potassium arsenite; potassium bicarbonate; potassium bisulfate; potassium meta-bisulfite; potassium phosphate, monobasic; potassium silicate; potassium sulfate; potassium sulfide; rochelle salts; sodium ammonium phosphate; sodium arsenate; sodium bisulfite; sodium chlorite; sodium orthosilicate; sodium sesquicarbonate; sodium silicate or water glass; sodium sulfate; and sodium thiosulfate. |
| 51470 | Industrial chemicals, as follows: cadmium sulfate; calcium carbide; calcium polysulfide; calcium silicate; carbic cake; carbic carbide; carbide powder, except abrasive powders; chalk precipitated; dicalcium phosphate, epsom salts; ferrous carbonate; ferrous chloride; ferrous sulfate; iron chloride; iron phosphate; iron sulfate; iron sulfide, artificial; lead arsenite; lime bisulfate; lime phosphate; magnesium arsenide; magnesium phosphate; magnesium silicate; magnesium silicofluoride; magnesium sulfate; magnesium trisilicate; monocalcium phosphate; monocalcium sulphate; palladium chloride; palladium salts and compounds; pea carbide; silver chlorides; silver cyanide, industrial; silver nitrate; silver sulfate-silver sulfide; sodium chlorite; sodium silico aluminate; zinc carbide; zinc cyanide; zinc hydrosulfite; zinc nitrate; zinc phosphate; and zinc sulfate. |
| 52130 | Ammoniacal gas liquors and spent oxide produced in coal gas purification. |
| 52140 | Creosote or dead oil; creosote oil distillates; and resinous oil X-1. |
| 53101 | Alizarin sulfonic; indigo, natural and synthetic; and phenosafranine. |
| 53230 | Chromium tanning mixtures. |
| 53290 | Tannins; and tanning and dyeing extracts of vegetable or animal origin. (Report natural indigo in export control Commodity No. 53101.) |
| 53310 | Luminescent zinc pigments, not radioactivated. |
| 53320 | Printing inks. |
| 53331 | Prepared ceramic colors, including liquid lusters. |
| 53332 | Lacquers, except aluminum, gold, pearl, and silver, and paperbacked gold stamping foil. |
| 54162 | Beef glands, and inedible dried pancreas, bulk. |
| 54162 | Animal products used for medicinal purposes, bulk, the following only: beef brain powder; beef heart extract; bone marrow; bone marrow concentrate; brain substance powder; fibrin muscle; glycerine extract of brain and muscle; and glycerin extract, red bone marrow. |
| 54163 | Ferments, other than yeast, except potato flour ferment. |
| 54170 | Pharmaceutical preparations for veterinary use, dosage or packed for retail sale, except antibiotics, sulfonamides, hormones, vitamins, and minerals. |
| 54191 | Bandages and surgical dressings, not impregnated or coated with pharmaceutical products, put up for retail sale. |
| 54199 | Dental rubber. |
| 55300 | Deodorants, nonpersonal. |
| 55420 | Detergents, the following only: Ethomid HT 15; Intramin WK and Y; and Permalene A-100, A-120, and A-180. |
| 55430 | Rifle cleaning compounds: abrasive pastes, compounds, and cake, except chemical, and steel burnishing mixtures. |
| 56100 | Urea fertilizer. |
| 57130 | Nonmilitary pyrotechnical articles. |
| 58132 | Other regenerated cellulose and chemical derivatives of cellulose. |
| 58191 | Hardened proteins. |
| 58192 | Modified natural resins (including ester gum), and chemical derivatives of natural rubber, all in unfinished or semi-finished form. |
| 58199 | Ammonium alginate. |

EXHIBIT 3—Continued

COMMODITIES DECONTROLLED FOR EXPORTS TO EASTERN EUROPEAN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES, EXCLUDING EAST GERMANY—Continued

| Export control commodity No. | Commodity description |
|------------------------------|---|
| 59920 | 0,0-dimethyl 0-P-nitro phenyl phosphorothioate; 0,0-diethyl 0-P-nitro phenyl phosphorothioate; 3,4-dichloropropionanilide; 3-amino-2,5-dichlorobenzoic acid 2-chloro-4-ethylamino-6-isopropylamino-S-triazine; 3-(3,4-dichlorophenyl)-1-methoxy-1-methylurea; 2-chloro-N-isopropylacetanilide; alpha-chloro-N,N-diallylacetamide; 2-chloro-4,6-bis(ethylamino)-S-triazine; a,a,a-trifluoro-2,6-dinitro-N,N-dipropyl-p-toluidine; 2-chloroallyl diethyldithiocarbamate; 2,3,5,6-tetrachloroterephthalic acid; 2,3-dichloroallyl diisopropylthiocarbamate; 2,3,3-trichloroallyl diisopropylthiocarbamate; and 4-chloro-2-butyl-N-chlorocarbaniolate. |
| 59951 | Inulin. |
| 59952 | Gluten and gluten flour. |
| 59958 | Casein hydrolysate; casein lactalbumin; lactalbumin; lactalbumin hydrolysate; lactarene (casein); and inedible soybean protein. |
| 59958 | Dextrins (e.g., British gum). |
| 59961 | Other tall oil. |
| 59963 | Pine oil, except pine-needle oil; terpene solvents, n.e.c. gum turpentine; and wood turpentine. |
| 59965 | Wood tar; wood tar oils; wood creosote; wood naphtha; and acetone oil. |
| 59966 | Wood pitch and products based thereon or on rosin. |
| 59973 | Other animal black, except activated. |
| 59977 | Prepared culture media. |
| 59978 | Charges for fire extinguishers. |
| 59994 | Pickling preparations for metal surfaces; auxiliary preparations for soldering, brazing or welding (fluxes, powders, pastes), containing metal and other constituents. |
| 59995 | Composite solvents, paint removers, thinners, and other similar products. |
| 59999 | Water softeners, water purifiers, and boiler feed water compounds. |
| 61230 | Rubber heels, soles, soling, top lifts, and top lift sheets. |
| 62102 | Other rubber cements. |
| 62103 | Rubber thread and cord, covered or bare. |
| 62930 | Other hygienic and pharmaceutical articles of unhardened rubber. |
| 62988 | Other articles of unhardened vulcanized rubber, n.e.c. |
| 63120 | Other plywood and wood panels, including wood-veneer and cellular peels. |
| 63141 | Improved wood (densified and/or impregnated with resin or resinlike materials). |
| 63142 | Reconstituted wood (particle board). |
| 63163 | Hoopwood, chipwood, wood chips; and poles, piles, posts, pickets, stakes, and similar products which are split, pointed or both, but not sawn lengthwise. |
| 63240 | Windmill towers. |
| 63269 | Wood manufactures, the following only: bee hives; boat parts, small, machined to shape; bridges; Fibrisir laminates of melaminephenol formaldehyde resins, sawdust, or ground wood and paper; hog troughs; patterns; propeller blades; propellers; and trestles. |
| 64122 | Fine paper. |
| 64130 | Kraft paper, in rolls or sheets, uncoated, as follows: abrasive base stock; acid proof; ammunition; antiacid manila; base wad stock; buffing; cable, base stock; cable filling, electrical; cartridge stock; coil winding; document manila, file folder; dynamite; electrical insulating; emery, base stock; expanding envelope stock; flat wallet stock; flint backing; frisket; gasket; gasket; graphite; guide stock; insulating, electrical patch base stock; pattern stock, polishing; red foiling (cartridge paper); red patch base stock; sandpaper backing; shell stock; silk wrap stock; tissue; tyman; voice coil stock; wallet stock; and washer stock. |
| 64180 | Machine-made paper and paperboard, simply finished, in rolls or sheets, n.e.c., and hand made paper, the following only: ammunition; guide stock; antiacid manila stock; armature; beaming; cable base stock; calendar roll stock; cartridge stock; coil winding; cone, yarn, designers pattern stock (except tissue); document manila file folder; dynamite; electrical; expanding envelope stock; flat wallet stock; flint backing stock; frisket; gasket; graphite base stock; gum wadding; insulating electrical; interleaving for film; jute tag stock; patch base stock; polishing base stock; portmanteau; red foiling (cartridge paper); red patch base stock; rope, for sand paper backing; sandpaper backing; shell stock; shot shell stock; silk wrap stock; slot insulation; steaming; stencil (18 lbs and over); stencil stock for oiling; tabulating-machine card stock; tape, rope stock for electrical insulating; time card stock; tyman; voice coil stock; wad base stock; wallet stock; washer stock; pattern stock; stencil blanks tabulating machine card stock; absorbent paper for matrix; interleaving; tissue paper under 18 pounds, except sanitary; ground-wood base stock for carbonizing; fine paper (uncoated for printing, writing); bible; check paper; mimeotype stencil; body stock for carbonizing, free from ground wood; box covering; carbonizing base stock; duplicating tissue; electrical insulating tissue; heat sealable tissue; imitation Japanese, India, lens, matrix tissue; pencil carbon stock; pottery tissue; press copy; rotochrome tissue; stencil tissue; stereotype tissue; tea bags; fibrillise; tissue for duplex decalomania; transfer stamping; and book lining. |
| 64191 | Kleerview (lacquer-coated glassine paper). |
| 64199 | Asphalt and tar saturated paper, heavy construction type. |
| 65126 | Yarn of wool or of fine animal hair. |
| 65130 | Cotton yarn, gray (unbleached); and unfinished cotton thread. |
| 65140 | Cotton yarn, carded, combed, finished; sewing, crochet, darning, and embroidery cotton thread. |
| 65172 | Rayon or acetate monofil. |
| 65177 | Rayon or acetate spun yarn, including singles and plied. |
| 65190 | Other yarns of textile fibers, n.e.c., including yarns of vegetable fibers, n.e.c. |
| 65211 | Gauze, tobacco cloth, and cheese cloth, unbleached, wholly or in chief weight cotton. |
| 65212 | Terry woven fabrics, unbleached, wholly or in chief weight cotton. |
| 65213 | Broadwoven fabrics, unbleached, wholly or in chief weight cotton. |
| 65221 | Gauze, tobacco cloth, and cheese cloth, bleached, dyed, colored, or otherwise finished, wholly or in chief weight cotton. |
| 65222 | Other terrywoven fabrics, bleached, dyed, colored, or otherwise finished, wholly or in chief weight cotton. |
| 65223 | Pile and chenille broadwoven fabrics and corduroy, bleached, dyed, colored, or otherwise finished, wholly or in chief weight cotton. |
| 65229 | Other broadwoven fabrics, bleached, dyed, colored, or otherwise finished, wholly or in chief weight cotton. |
| 65230 | Other broadwoven remnants less than 10 yards in length, and fabrics, n.e.c., wholly or in chief weight cotton. |
| 65301 | Broadwoven fabrics wholly or in chief weight flax (linen) or jute. |
| 65321 | Other broadwoven fabrics, wholly or in chief weight of wool and/or fine animal hair, excluding pile or chenille. |
| 65322 | Pile and chenille broadwoven fabrics, wholly or in chief weight of wool and/or fine animal hair. |
| 65370 | Knit or crocheted fabrics, not elastic or rubberized, wholly or in chief weight cotton or wool. |
| 65390 | Other broadwoven fabrics, wholly or in chief weight jute or wool. |
| 65401 | Narrow woven fabrics, nonelastic, wholly or in chief weight cotton, jute, flax, or wool. |
| 65402 | Woven labels, badges, emblems, and insignia, excluding embroidered, wholly or in chief weight cotton, jute, flax, or wools. |
| 65403 | Hat braid, all fibers, and other trimmings, nonelastic, wholly or in chief weight cotton, flax, wool, or metal. |
| 65406 | Embroideries, wholly or in chief weight cotton, flax, or wool. |
| 65407 | Lace machine fabrics, wholly or in chief weight cotton, flax, or wool. |
| 65510 | Other coated or impregnated felt fabrics; and felts and felt articles wholly or in chief weight cotton, jute, wool and/or wool-like specialty hairs. |
| 65541 | Bonded fabrics and articles wholly or in chief weight cotton or wool. (1) |
| 65542 | Other textile fabrics coated with gum or amylaceous substances. |
| 65543 | Other textile fabrics, n.e.c., coated or impregnated with resin or other plastic materials. |
| 65544 | Other textile fabrics, n.e.c., coated or impregnated with oil. |
| 65546 | Other textile fabrics, n.e.c., coated or impregnated. |
| 65550 | Elastic fabrics and trimmings, woven or braided. |
| 65560 | Other cordage, cable, rope, and twine, and manufactures thereof, wholly or in chief weight other textile fibers, n.e.c. |
| 65570 | Other hat bodies. |
| 65581 | Wadding and articles of wadding (excluding cellulose wadding), n.e.c., textile flock; and dust and mill neps, wholly or chief weight of other textile fibers. |
| 65610 | Bags, wholly or in chief weight of cotton, jute, or wool. |
| 65620 | Sails of canvas; and tarpaulins, tents, awnings, and other made-up canvas goods, wholly or in chief weight cotton. |
| 65662 | Blankets, wholly or in chief weight cotton. (Report electric blankets in export control commodity No. 65663.) |
| 65663 | Blankets, wholly or in chief weight wool, except electric. |
| 65691 | Linens and other furnishing articles, wholly or in chief weight cotton or wool, excluding knit, bonded, felt, quilted or stuffed articles. |
| 65692 | Other made-up textile articles, n.e.c. |
| 65730 | Carpets and rugs, wholly or in chief weight cotton, wool, or jute. |
| 65740 | Vinyl asbestos tiles. |
| 65770 | Tapestries, hand woven or needle-worked, wholly or in chief weight cotton or wool. |
| 65780 | Mats, matting, screens, and other items, n.e.c., of cotton or jute plaiting materials. |
| 66181 | Asphalt and tar roofing and siding. |
| 66246 | Nonrefractory ceramic hollow tubes. |
| 66312 | Hand polishing stones and similar stones of natural abrasives. |
| 66320 | Other abrasive paper and cloth, coated with natural abrasives, except dental abrasives. |
| 66381 | Packing, gaskets, textiles, yarns, and other manufactures of asbestos, other than friction materials, n.e.c. |
| 66391 | Other laboratory and industrial ceramic wares, not refractory. |
| 66420 | Other optical glass and elements thereof, not optically worked. |
| 66470 | Other laminated glass or toughened safety glass. |
| 66480 | Mirrors for automotive vehicles. |
| 66494 | Other articles of glass fiber, n.e.c. (Report glass fiber yarn, roving, and strand in export control commodity No. 65180, and tape in No. 65380.) |
| 66512 | Glass inners for vacuum vessels. |
| 66581 | Laboratory, hygienic, or pharmaceutical glassware. |
| 66585 | Articles of glass, n.e.c., the following only: floaters, glass valves, and ballentini reflective material. |

EXHIBIT 3—Continued

COMMODITIES DECONTROLLED FOR EXPORTS TO EASTERN EUROPEAN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES, EXCLUDING EAST GERMANY—Continued

| Export control commodity No. | Commodity description |
|------------------------------|---|
| 66700 | Diamonds, rubies and sapphires, natural and synthetic, suitable for gem stones. (Report industrial diamonds, natural, in export control commodity No. 27515; and report stones mounted or unmounted, worked so as to be recognizable as parts of meters, measuring instruments, clocks, watches, etc., in the appropriate classification provided for parts of the specific item.) |
| 68111 | Silver, leaf. |
| 69110 | Finished structural parts and structures, iron or steel, as follows: architectural and ornamental work; anchors and fittings for reinforcing refractory walls; bulkhead (water gates); gangways: sluice gates; guardrails; platforms; portholes not specially designed for military watercraft; prayer rails; loading ramps (nonmechanical); and turnstiles, not electric or coin operated. |
| 69120 | Aluminum structural parts as follows: fencing and railing, ornamental; gangways; portholes; prayer rails; scaffolding equipment; tower sections; and turnstiles. |
| 69211 | Septic tanks, iron or steel. |
| 69213 | Septic tanks, aluminum. |
| 69221 | Other shipping containers, iron or steel. |
| 69222 | Other shipping containers, aluminum, including barrels, boxes, chests and collapsible tubes. |
| 69510 | Hand tools mainly used in agriculture or forestry, and parts, n.e.c., as follows: cant hooks; digging bars; digging spuds; gardeners' trowels; mattocks; picks; pike poles; wheel-type cultivators; and wheel-type seeders. |
| 69521 | Power saw blades, woodworking; and hand-operated saws, hand saw frames, and saw blades, except hacksaw blades; and parts n.e.c. |
| 69522 | Metal-cutting shears and tinmen's snips, not power-operated; wrenches; pilers, pincers and other similar hand tools, and parts, n.e.c.; and files, rasps and file accessories. |
| 69523 | Other hand tools, n.e.c., and parts. |
| 69524 | Other cutting tools, dies, and parts. |
| 69525 | Other machine knives and blades. |
| 69609 | Knife blanks. |
| 69791 | Steel wool, pot scourers, and other polishing pads, iron or steel. |
| 69794 | Figures, flower racks, mirrors, trays, and photograph or picture frames of base metals, n.e.c. |
| 69811 | Motor vehicle locks; ignition locks; and tire locks. |
| 69811 | Window locks and safety hasps, nonferrous metal; and key blanks, all metals. |
| 69812 | Hardware and parts of base metal, as follows: transportation hardware, all metals; furniture beading, nickel-plated steel; edgings, all metals; furniture hardware stainless steel; builders hardware, nonferrous metal; hand rails, all metals; and other hardware, stainless steel, except hinges and butts. |
| 69830 | Other chains and parts, iron and steel, n.e.c. |
| 69840 | Anchors, grapnels, and parts, iron or steel. |
| 69854 | Buckles with die-cut inserts, and belt hooks, all metals; belt fasteners (other than buckles), clasps, grommets, and similar articles of stainless steel. |
| 69861 | Other wire springs, iron or steel. |
| 69885 | Commercial closures of metal, n.e.c. |
| 69891 | Iron or steel cargo hooks; and malleable iron manhole covers. |
| 69899 | Other aluminum or aluminum alloy castings and forgings. |
| 69899 | Articles of nonferrous metals, n.e.c., other than copper or copper alloy, the following only: boat spikes, wire nails, wire staples, and wire spikes; bolts, screws, rivets, washers and similar articles, except screw eyes and screw hooks; brackets for mounting outboard motors; bulletin boards; cans, n.e.c., made or cut from nonferrous base metals; caskets: clothes-line (dryer) reels; fog horns, nonelectric, for ships; hinge chaplets; lids for boxes; link chains, mooring swivels; car locks; pipe hangers; riget tile; tool boxes and tool chests, empty; and utility boxes. |
| 71189 | Windmills and parts, n.e.c. |
| 71211 | Cotton gins. |
| 71212 | Looms other than cotton looms. |
| 71213 | Parts, accessories, and attachments for: (a) cotton gins, and (b) looms other than cotton looms. |
| 71213 | Other parts, accessories and attachments for machines for extruding man-made fibers, and for other machines for preparing and processing natural or man-made fibers into yarns, and for winding. |
| 71214 | Millinery dies (hat blocks), nonferrous metal. |
| 71215 | Silk screen printing equipment; pleating (folding) machines; and parts and attachments, n.e.c. |
| 71811 | Laminators, electric, for restoring manuscripts and documents; and parts and attachments. |
| 71811 | Other machinery for making or finishing cellulosic pulp, paper or paperboard; and parts and attachments. |
| 71812 | Other papercutting machines and machines, n.e.c., for the manufacture of articles of paper pulp, paper or paperboard; and parts and attachments, n.e.c. |
| 71821 | Bookbinding machines, and parts. |
| 71829 | Price marking machines, and plane-o-plate rotary shavers, and parts. |
| 71831 | Grain cleaning machines, and corn husking machines, and parts. |
| 71839 | Chocolate homogenizers, and parts. |
| 71842 | Snow plows, farm-type; and parts, accessories, and attachments. |
| 71915 | Other airconditioning and refrigerating equipment; and parts, n.e.c., including parts for self-contained air conditioning machines. (Report compressors in export control commodity No. 71922.) |
| 71919 | Other machines and equipment, other than domestic, for treatment of material by a process involving a change in temperature; and parts, n.e.c. |
| 71922 | Compressors, refrigeration and airconditioning type, $\frac{1}{2}$ horsepower and under; and parts, n.e.c. |
| 71923 | Laboratory centrifuges, n.e.c., and parts, n.e.c. |
| 71931 | Automobile lifts; jacks for automotive vehicles or aircraft; and parts, n.e.c. |
| 71931 | Other hand-operated, mechanical and hydraulic jacks; and parts, n.e.c. |
| 71931 | Farm elevators; and parts, n.e.c. |
| 71931 | Elevators and moving stairways; and parts, n.e.c. |
| 71941 | Butter churns, farm type; and parts. |
| 71942 | Condensers and evaporators for nonelectric domestic refrigerators; and parts. |
| 71951 | Cutting machines for ceramics and similar nonmetallic materials, except quartz, crystal, masonry, or stone. |
| 71951 | Other machines, n.e.c., for working asbestos-cement, ceramic concrete, quartz crystals, masonry, stone (including artificial, precious and semiprecious stones), and similar mineral materials. (Report parts in export control commodity No. 71954.) |
| 71952 | Other machines, n.e.c., for working bone, ebonite, hard plastics, and other hard carving materials. (Report parts in export control commodity No. 71954.) |
| 71954 | Parts, accessories, and attachments for cutting machines for ceramics and similar nonmetallic materials, except glass, quartz crystal, masonry or stone. |
| 71954 | Parts, accessories, and attachments for other machines for working asbestos-cement, ceramics, concrete, quartz crystals, masonry, stone (including artificial, precious, and semiprecious stones), and similar mineral materials. |
| 71954 | Parts, accessories, and attachments for other machines for working bone, ebonite, hard plastic, and other hard carving materials. |
| 71961 | Other calendaring machines and similar rolling machines, n.e.c.; and parts. |
| 71963 | Lead scale weights for weighing machines. |
| 71964 | Hydra-blast parts cleaners, and parts therefor; and windshield washer sets. |
| 71964 | Sprayers and dusters, agricultural and pesticidal, except lawn sprinklers; and parts, n.e.c., except nozzles. |
| 71964 | Other spray nozzles of metal; and hand-operated spray guns; and parts, n.e.c. |
| 71964 | Other sprayers and spraying equipment, n.e.c.; and parts, n.e.c. |
| 71980 | Concrete and bituminous pavers, finishers, and spreaders; and parts and accessories, n.e.c. |
| 71980 | Windshield wipers, nonelectric, and parts, n.e.c. |
| 71980 | Shock absorbers, mechanical or hydraulic. |
| 71992 | Other taps, cocks, valves and similar appliances, n.e.c., and parts. |
| 71994 | Other gaskets (joints), laminated metal and nonmetal material, or set of gaskets of two or more materials. |
| 72320 | Other electrical insulators and fittings of insulating materials, n.e.c. |
| 72410 | Color television broadcast receivers, whether or not combined with radio or phonograph; and unassembled color television kits. |
| 72499 | Automobile radio receiver antennas; and parts and accessories, n.e.c., specially designed for home-type radio and television receivers and automobile receivers, except communications receivers. |
| 72505 | Galleys, buffet servers, ovens, and other equipment specially designed for aircraft; electric heaters for automotive vehicles; and parts. |
| 72620 | Other medical and dental X-ray and gamma ray equipment; and medical and dental apparatus based on the use of radiations from radio-active substances; and parts, n.e.c. |
| 72912 | Battery separators and blanks, wood; and battery parts made of rubber. |
| 72941 | Spark plugs, aircraft and automotive types, and parts. (Report insulators in export control commodity No. 72320.) |
| 72941 | Other electrical starting and ignition equipment for other internal combustion engines; and parts. |
| 72942 | Other motor vehicle lighting equipment, signaling equipment, horns, electrical windshield wipers, and defrosters; and parts therefor. |
| 72951 | Other electricity supply meters. (Report parts in export control commodity No. 86199.) |
| 72952 | Test benches, electrical, for automotive engines, brakes, pumps and speedometers. |
| 72960 | Electromechanical hand tools; and parts. |
| 72996 | Other lighting carbons, brush stock, and carbon brushes. |
| 73280 | Heaters for nonmilitary vehicles; and parts. |
| 73291 | Other motorcycles, motor bikes, and motor scooters. |
| 73292 | Parts and accessories for other motorcycles, motor bikes, and motor scooters. |
| 73300 | Logging wagons; and parts. (Report off-highway trucks and trailers in export control commodity No. 73203.) |
| 73593 | Buoys, all metals; pontoons for pipe lines, iron or steel; and fiberglass swimming pools, floating. |
| 81210 | Central heating apparatus, n.e.c., and parts, n.e.c. |
| 81241 | Vapor-proof electric light fixtures. |

EXHIBIT 3—Continued

COMMODITIES DECONTROLLED FOR EXPORTS TO EASTERN EUROPEAN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES, EXCLUDING EAST GERMANY—Continued

| Export control commodity No. | Commodity description |
|------------------------------|---|
| 81242 | Explosion-proof lighting fixtures; and vapor-proof lighting fixtures. |
| 82103 | Mattresses, mattress supports, and similar stuffed furnishings, n.e.c., cotton. |
| 82108 | Plastic furniture; and laboratory furniture, metal; and parts, n.e.c. |
| 83100 | Travel goods, handbags, and other personal goods of cotton. |
| 84111 | Men's and boys' outer garments (excludes shirts), not knit or crocheted: (a) wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool or, (b) safety apparel and raincoats, all materials. |
| 84112 | Women's, misses', girls' children's and infants' outer garments, including blouses, waists, and blouse shirts, not knit or crocheted: (a) wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool, or (b) safety apparel and raincoats, all materials. |
| 84113 | Men's and boys' undergarments, including outer shirts, not knit or crocheted, wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool. |
| 84114 | Women's, girls' and infants' undergarments (excludes blouse shirts), not knit or crocheted, wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool. |
| 84121 | Handkerchiefs, wholly or in chief weight of cotton. |
| 84125 | Corsets, brassieres, and girdles of cotton or other textile fibers, n.e.c., except rubberized. |
| 84126 | Gloves and mittens, not knit or crocheted, wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool. |
| 84127 | Cuffs and collars, wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool; and neckties, cravats, mufflers, and scarves, not knit or crocheted, all materials. |
| 84129 | Clothing accessories, not knit or crocheted, wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool, n.e. cc. |
| 84130 | Safety apparel and clothing accessories of leather. |
| 84141 | Gloves, knit or crocheted, wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool. |
| 84142 | Hosiery, not elastic or rubberized, wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool. |
| 84143 | Undergarments, including shirts, knit or crocheted, wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool. |
| 84145 | Knitted or crocheted elastic fabric and articles thereof, except ankle supports, knee-pads, and wristlets. |
| 84146 | Men's and boys' outer garments (excludes shirts), not knit or crocheted, not elastic or rubberized: (a) waterproof, all fibers, (b) neckties, cravats, mufflers, and scarves, all fibers, and (c) other outer garments, wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool. |
| 84147 | Women's and misses' outer garments, knit or crocheted, not elastic or rubberized: (a) waterproof, all fibers, (b) mufflers and scarves, all fibers, and (c) other outer garments, wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool. |
| 84148 | Girls', children's, and infants' outer garments, knit or crocheted, not elastic or rubberized: (a) waterproof, all fibers, (b) mufflers and scarves, all fibers, and (c) other outer garments, wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool. |
| 84149 | Other nonapparel articles, knit or crocheted, not elastic or rubberized. |
| 84154 | Hat and cap materials, except hat bodies, wholly or in chief weight of cotton, jute, wool or textile manufactures, n.e.c. (Report hat bodies in export control commodity No. 65570.) |
| 84155 | Other millinery, hats, caps, and other headgear, n.e.c., including helmets. |
| 84160 | Other apparel and clothing accessories, including surgeons gloves, rubber or rubberized. |
| 84202 | Artificial fur and articles thereof, wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool. |
| 85100 | Nonmilitary spats, leggings, and gaiters, wholly or in chief weight of cotton or wool. |
| 86120 | Protective spectacles and goggles (safety equipment). |
| 86134 | Other microscopes, excluding electron and proton; microprojectors; and photomicrographic equipment; and parts and accessories. |
| 86135 | Telescopes, including astronomical telescopes. |
| 86171 | Dental hand instruments and tools for use with hand pieces, n.e.c., and parts. |
| 86172 | Whirlpool baths. |
| 86182 | Other revolution counters, production counters, and similar counting devices, n.e.c. |
| 86193 | Optical measuring and checking instruments; and parts. |
| 86193 | Other measuring and checking instruments, appliances and machines; and parts. |
| 86196 | Laboratory type hydrometers and similar instruments; and thermometers, pyrometers, barometers, hygrometers, psychrometers, and any combination of these. |
| 86243 | Paper, paperboard and cloth, sensitized, not developed. |
| 86248 | Exposed sensitized plates, and exposed and developed plates, except lantern slides. |
| 86401 | Other clocks, electric and nonelectric; and time recording and time stamp machines. |
| 86402 | Other clock parts. |
| 89111 | Magnetic recording and/or reproducing equipment for voice and music only. |
| 89112 | Parts and accessories for magnetic recording and/or reproducing equipment for voice and music only. |
| 89300 | Other finished articles, n.e.c., of artificial plastic materials, except articles wholly or partially made of polyimides, polybenzimidazole, polyimido-pyrrolone, aromatic polyamide, polyparaxylylene, polytetrafluoroethylene, or polychlorotrifluoroethylene; or items wholly made of other fluorocarbon polymers of copolymers. |
| 89425 | Artificial Christmas trees, metal; and tinsel of metal. |
| 89442 | Base metal wire wickets; and safety apparel and equipment for recreational purposes. |
| 89512 | Stapling wire (all metals) on spools; and nonferrous metal staples for hand-stapling devices. |
| 89711 | Jewelry and related items of carat gold, platinum and platinum group metals, except rosaries. |
| 89714 | Other articles of other than precious metals, incorporating pearls or precious or semi-precious stones. |
| 89715 | Hollow ware, solid or plated, of precious metals; and silver leaf. |
| 89927 | Hand sieves and hand riddles, laboratory types. |
| 89927 | Other wire cloth sieves. |
| 89926 | Hat braids of natural or man-made fibers. |
| 89934 | Cigarette and cigar lighters of precious metals. |
| 89952 | Leatherette buttons. |
| 89955 | Corset stays, and similar supports for apparel. |
| 89994 | Wool-like specialty hair prepared for making wigs and similar articles. |
| 89995 | Wigs, false beards, and other articles, n.e.c., of wool-like specialty hair. |
| 89997 | Vacuum bottles, jugs, and chests, complete (assembled or unassembled), usable only for hot or cold food or drinks. |
| 94100 | Coin, other than gold coin, not being legal tender. (Report numismatic and collectors coins in export control commodity No. 89600; coins mounted in objects of personal adornment in Nos. 89711-89720; coins for legal tender in Nos. 68070 and 68080.) |

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER SIGNED HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD BILL 9 YEARS AGO TODAY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, a great President performed a great deed for Hawaii and the Nation on this day exactly 9 years ago when, on March 18, 1959, President Eisenhower signed the bill granting statehood for Hawaii.

A week earlier, the Senate had passed the bill by a 76-to-15 vote; the House did likewise the following day with a 323-to-89 vote.

The statehood victory climaxed a long history of struggle for equal rights by the people of Hawaii. It required the support of countless friends over decades alternately filled with disappointments, high hopes, and frustrations. No campaign for Hawaii was more arduous—none more rewarding when it triumphed.

During the difficult years preceding statehood, one pronouncement shone like a beacon of light. In his state of

the Union message on January 5, 1956, President Eisenhower spoke of "one particular challenge" confronting Americans. He said:

In the Hawaiian Islands, East meets West. To the Islands, Asia and Europe and the Western Hemisphere, all the continents, have contributed their peoples and their cultures to display a unique example of a community that is a successful laboratory in human brotherhood.

Statehood, supported by the repeatedly expressed desire of the Islands' people and by our traditions, would be a shining example of the American way to the entire earth. Consequently, I urgently request this Congress to grant statehood for Hawaii.

Never before had any President issued such a clarion call for action. In 3 years, the barriers were beaten down and the issue at long last resolved on the side of justice and fair play.

I believe Hawaii has kept faith with President's Eisenhower's expressed hope that Hawaii would be a "shining example

of the American way to the entire earth." The spirit of understanding harmony prevails today among the various ethnic groups, as it has for many years in the past.

Racial friction is the exception; racial cooperation the rule in the Hawaiian community.

Despite the pressures of a fast-growing population, despite urbanization and its problems, the people of Hawaii hold firm to the ideal of racial amity and concord.

Diversity within unity binds together the cosmopolitan population. The people accept and practice the art of living and working together side by side, regardless of race, color, or creed. In short, they have the "aloha spirit."

It is my sincere hope that this spirit of aloha will be perpetuated not only in my native State but also among peoples everywhere who seek racial understanding and harmony, now and in the future.

SOVIET SHIPPING STRENGTH

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion in the present administration over the strength of the Soviet merchant marine.

One of the latest developments has been the publication by the Department of Commerce and the Maritime Administration of a booklet entitled "The Soviet Merchant Marine." The conclusion of this document is that while the Soviet merchant fleet is expanding rapidly, it poses no real threat to the United States.

For some time, I have been on record as opposed to this point of view. I believe there is no question that the rapid expansion of the Soviet merchant fleet does pose a significant threat to our maritime position.

The president of the Shipbuilders Council of America has delivered an important speech rebutting the conclusions of "The Soviet Merchant Marine." As always, Mr. Hood has spoken wisely and with authority. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY EDWIN M. HOOD, PRESIDENT, SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA, BEFORE 1967 BIENNIAL CONVENTION, MARITIME TRADES DEPARTMENT, AFL-CIO

In Washington recently, there was published an ambidextrous booklet dealing with "The Soviet Merchant Marine." It tries valiantly to "serve two masters"—those few in high government posts who downgrade the aggressive, steadily expanding, build-up of Russian strength on the oceans on the one hand; and on the other hand, those who compose a considerable and increasing segment of the American people who are deeply troubled by the threat posed by this newly acquired sea power in the hands of the Kremlin.

This document, issued under the joint auspices of the Department of Commerce and the Maritime Administration, concedes in its first sentence that "Soviet merchant sea power is an accomplished fact." It is filled with statistics confirming the persistent expansion of the Russian merchant fleet, and further acknowledges that "since the Soviet merchant marine is a state-owned enterprise, it can be used as a political instrument for economic purposes and an economic instrument for political purposes."

Against the backdrop of our own country's steadily diminishing maritime resources, the above statements and facts—to mention only a few—are justifiable reasons for alarm, especially by those who are alert to the subtle motivations and machinations of the communist mind. The long-range objective of international communism defined by Marx and Lenin some 50 years ago has not changed. Political relationships between the U.S.S.R. and other countries may have varied considerably in the meantime, but there is no plausible or solid evidence to prove, or even to suggest, that the goal of world domination has been abandoned.

In a related sense, the tide of events during the past decade strongly supports the conclusion that a major, long-term policy of the Soviet Union is to stay out of a great war and to achieve fundamental goals by developing a massive sea potential for strategic, political and commercial purposes. To this end, Russian maritime policy is designed to achieve supremacy at sea in the span of only a few years.

Yet, this latest government pamphlet—for all of its pertinent statistical compilations

and notations—minimizes not only the provocations of Russian policy but also the approaching numerical and quantitative superiority of the Soviet shipping fleet. For substantiation, it freely quotes the public utterances of Soviet maritime officials and abundantly cites Soviet publications. The reliability of such source references can be quickly disposed of by any first-year student of communist propaganda, and it is somewhat astounding to find sensitive conclusions predicated on this kind of questionable material.

In so doing, however, the Maritime Administration and the Department of Commerce are merely "serving the other master"—the bureaucratic mechanism which for years has assiduously promoted the potentially volatile idea that the United States—and the free world—have nothing to fear from the Russians on the high seas. This kind of thinking has influenced the shaping of U.S. maritime policy to the point that our country could today hardly qualify as a third rate, let alone a second class, maritime power. And, I suspect this kind of thinking will find negative expression when the maritime budget for the coming fiscal year is prepared or when long overdue legislation to revitalize the American merchant marine is considered early next year by the Congress.

While the Russians have been putting together a merchant marine which already exceeds the American shipping fleet in numbers of vessels and within a relatively short time will surpass us in tonnage, it seems that the architects of U.S. maritime policy have been oblivious to all that has been taking place.

From a feeble and unassuming beginning in 1945, the Soviet Union has ascended to a position of awesome and threatening strength on the oceans in 1967. But, we are told—fear not—there is no cause for concern! According to the booklet, the purposes of the Russians are simply "business cooperation" or "the development of foreign commerce." We are told that the Soviet merchant marine will never be large enough, in relation to the balance of the world, to cause any great havoc on traditional shipping patterns or to exercise any great leverage on ocean shipping rates. Even so, the booklet includes this pregnant passage: "The Soviet shipping authorities could institute lower freight rates at any time and in any trade of their choosing . . ." to accomplish desired political or economic gains. And then it quotes the Russian Minister of the Merchant Fleet as a defender of "a policy of cooperation."

Adherence to the customary ways of doing business, respect for the traditions of ocean shipping, and recognition of sovereign rights are scarcely traits of the communists. Their record of broken treaties is a fact of history, and the list of instances in which the Soviet merchant marine has been used as "a political instrument for economic purposes" and as "an economic instrument for political purposes" continues to multiply.

Russia emerged from World War II with a nondescript fleet of only 432 merchant vessels totaling less than 2 million tons. It wasn't until 1958—less than 10 years ago—that the Soviets embarked on an ambitious fleet expansion program. By the end of 1965, her tonnage had reached nearly 10 million tons. Her current five year plan (1966-70) is programmed to attain a fleet totaling 15 million tons by the end of 1970.

There seems to be little question of this goal being met, since in May of this year, Russia had 526 merchant vessels totaling 4.3 million tons under construction or on order. As a point of reference, on the same date, only 45 merchant ships totaling 600,000 tons were under construction or on order for the U.S. merchant fleet. As of June 30, 1966, better than 25 percent of all ships on order or under construction throughout the world were for the Soviet Union. Whereas Russia

has taken delivery of more than 100 ships per year for the past several years, deliveries of U.S. flag merchant ships have averaged only 15 ships per year.

Her impressive merchant fleet expansion program is but one facet of Russia's ambitions on the seas. Her Navy, already second only to the United States, is undergoing enormous improvement. Her fishing fleet is acknowledged to be the most modern in the world. More than 100 Russian vessels are engaged in oceanographic research. These ships as well as her fishing vessels are equipped with sophisticated electronic equipment and serve the dual purpose of observing our military and naval deployments and space shots. The Russian underwater fleet of submarines already possesses a capability to launch ballistic missiles, and it has now been revealed that the first of what is expected to be a series of aircraft carriers for the Soviet Navy is under construction. In the opinion of Admiral Ephraim P. Holmes, USN, Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic, for NATO, and Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, this latter development "signifies awareness of what it takes to project forces forward."

The Russians remember all too well that which we are often quick to forget—the importance of control of the oceans to survival. With a superiority of merchant ships capable of selective strangulation of essential trade routes, the Soviets could slowly suffocate the sinews of commerce and bring the entire world to its knees.

Admiral John S. McCain, Commander-in-Chief, U.S. Naval Forces, Europe, put it this way the other day during an interview in London when he said: "The Russians have gone to sea in the interest of Soviet goals because they recognize fully the importance of the oceans to the achievement of communist ambitions." Similar assessments of Soviet sea space accomplishments have come from our top naval leaders in the Atlantic and the Pacific. On November 17 in New York, before a gathering of naval architects, marine engineers, shipbuilders, shipowners, component manufacturers and other ocean oriented professions, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, USN, used none of the minimization of the Maritime Administration/Department of Commerce booklet when he referred to the Russian challenge on the oceans. He did not quibble with words, and made it plain that he was serving only the concept of continued "mastery on the high seas" for the United States.

It should be emphasized—and reemphasized—that the United States is today the world's leading sea power. It must also be realized that the future strength and affluence of our nation will largely be determined by the priorities we now assign to the correction of any weaknesses or deficiencies which presently limit our power at sea. By sea power, let it be understood, I mean not only our naval fleet, but also our merchant marine, supporting shipyards, labor force and the full spectrum of industrial capabilities needed to use the seas, in the national interest, during times of emergency as well as during times of calm.

The United States, by all standards, is indeed a great sea power, but it is important to note that the margin of sea power superiority which sets us apart from the balance of the world is only slight. Moreover, there is an alarming imbalance between the quality and effectiveness of our naval and maritime strength. While we boast of the most powerful Navy the world has ever known—and this is more than a boast, it is a reality of which our people can be justifiably proud—we, at the same time, have a merchant marine not only grossly inadequate in terms of numbers of ships, but constituted predominantly of vessels built during World War II. The latter are frequently described—and properly so—as obsolete "rust buckets."

As a consequence, the U.S. flag shipping fleet is too small, too slow and too uneconomic to serve our rapidly expanding trade movements or to provide satisfactory logistic support to our military forces spread throughout the world.

The sorry state of our merchant fleet did not occur overnight. For nearly a decade, high naval officials and industry and labor leaders have called for corrective programs. But the magnitude of Federal support and the level of activity by U.S. shipping has been inadequate. There have been no comprehensive actions to bring about a rational progression of improvement. Now, there is serious national concern about the adequacy of the American merchant marine to meet future emergency requirements—in the years 1970, 1971 and beyond. Our shipping resources continue to decline sharply as those of the Russians continue to increase significantly.

The Soviets are assuring the adequacy of their future needs by a resolute policy and meticulous actions. By 1970, the Soviet merchant marine will carry, as the Maritime Administration/Department of Commerce document says, "a substantially higher share of Soviet foreign trade than the present 50 percent." In striking comparison, the U.S. flag merchant marine today carries less than 8 percent of our own trade and commerce, and if existing trends are not soon reversed, it is doubtful that our fleet will carry 5 percent by 1970.

No other figures more dramatically demonstrate the contrasting priorities which the United States and the Soviet Union have assigned to shipping affairs. The Department of Commerce/Maritime Administration pamphlet fails to equate or compare Soviet maritime progress with U.S. maritime decline. With "tongue in cheek," it ascribes no sinister motives to the Russians on the sea; and, as mentioned earlier it endeavors to "serve two masters."

But, the New Testament tells us: "No man can serve two masters . . . Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Similarly, no man—and no publication—can successfully serve strength and weakness simultaneously. In maritime affairs, the distinction between Soviet strength and American weakness is clear and precise, and the time for rationalization as to what the Russians are up to is long past.

Mr. Leon M. Herman, an expert in Soviet economics at the Library of Congress, made the following conclusion not long ago after analyzing many of the same statistics and trends affecting Russian shipping objectives which went into the Department of Commerce/Maritime Administration booklet:

"The present headlong rush to expand the maritime fleet under their control must therefore be viewed as a carefully conceived, long-range strategic operation, intended to propel the economic power of the Soviet state into new directions, paralleling the path of Communist political expansionism, toward the continents and islands inhabited by the newly developing, often unsettled, nations of the world. In such a context, it can serve as a mighty instrument at the disposal of Soviet foreign policy for the pursuit of its overriding goal of instituting and supporting dictatorial Communist regimes all around the world."

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate has also warned:

"Against the background of Russia's great strides in maritime strength there does not seem . . . to be any logic which would justify the apparent lack of concern of our Government toward the steadily diminishing stature and capabilities of the U.S. merchant fleet. Not only is the national security of the United States of America at stake, but so too is the collective security of the entire free world."

To all of this, the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Washington and

Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Senator Warren G. Magnuson, made the following observation:

"The decline of the American merchant marine and the rapid strengthening of that of the U.S.S.R. calls for a decision by the Congress, the administration, and the people of the United States.

"If we wait too long there will be no decision at all which we might make; the U.S.S.R., at the rate she is progressing on the seas, will have eliminated her rivals and taken over most of the world's ocean commerce."

AHEPA

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the U.S. Congress will be honored today at the 18th biennial national banquet of the Order of AHEPA in Washington, D.C. AHEPA, the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, is a benevolent and educational organization of Americans of Greek origin.

AHEPA objectives promote good citizenship and loyalty to the United States, encourage a better understanding of the ideals of Hellenism and Hellenic culture, uphold personal morality, inspire the spirit of altruism, and sustain the cause of education. During its 46 years of existence, AHEPA has given financial aid to worthy students and educational institutions, to relief programs for disaster victims, and to medical, educational, and research institutions in Greece. AHEPA has made and is continuing to make invaluable contributions which have formed and strengthened the traditions of the United States.

NATURAL RESOURCES—A GROWING CONCERN

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, recently there has been growing concern over the use and conservation of our natural resources.

The University of Wyoming has taken a positive step forward to see that these treasures are properly protected and used by helping to direct a biological research station at Jackson Hole, Wyo., in cooperation with the New York Zoological Society and Grand Teton National Park.

An article appeared recently in the Laramie Boomerang, a daily newspaper, describing the proposed activities of this organization for the coming summer. The station will be headed by 15 scientists, including eight from the University of Wyoming.

This research project underscores the need for my bill, S. 1684, to provide for the establishment of an Office of Natural Science Research in the National Park Service and a system of fellowships for support of research in the natural sciences.

The article calls attention to the need for increased research in this area and the need for a vehicle to allow for cooperation between private groups, universities, and the National Park Service.

The national parks offer excellent natural laboratories in which to conduct research that will be of great value to future generations.

S. 1684 would promote the proper level of cooperative natural science research

in our national parks, following along the path broken by the University of Wyoming.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACKSON HOLE RESEARCH PLANS MADE

Practically everything from the heartbeat of trout to the vocalizations of sparrows will be investigated next summer by 15 scientists—including eight from the University of Wyoming—at the Jackson Hole Biological Research Station.

The station is operated by UW in cooperation with the New York Zoological Society and Grand Teton National Park. Research projects and investigators who will be active during the coming season were selected last week by the station advisory board.

L. Floyd Clarke, head of the UW zoology-physiology department and director of the research station, says the advisory board annually receives many more applications than the facility can accommodate.

Five UW faculty members and three graduate students will conduct studies at the research station next summer.

These investigators and their projects include Alan A. Beetle, professor of plant science, big game range problems; Robert C. Bergstrom, professor of veterinary science, parasites in elk; Edward M. Lonsdale, professor of electrical engineering, radio tracking and cardiology studies of native trout in rivers and lakes; Charles McLaughlin, professor of zoology-physiology, study of native mammals;

John Swatek, professor of zoology-physiology, genetic studies of wild fruit fly populations; and three graduate student projects, James Kinker, Laramie, fisheries biology; Robert Wiley, Laramie, creel census on the Snake River; and William Good, St. Helens, Ore., drift of water insects in the Snake River.

Projects planned by out-of-state scientists include two studies on communication between animals, two parasite or insect studies, one on wild mushrooms, and another on small birds and wildlife.

Research station activity also includes a conservation program for which several college students are selected as participants. These receive instruction in the basic operations of the station and its relationship with other agencies such as the National Park Service, the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Wyoming Game and Fish Department. Each is required to conduct a research project during the program.

Clarke says the station has three main functions. These are to give emphasis to basic biological research, to support research that is of direct benefit to the state and cooperating agencies, and to provide an opportunity for young investigators to work in the field under the supervision of seasoned researchers.

Clarke says the station's location, near Jackson Lake Lodge in the Grand Teton National Park, is ideal because it provides ample freedom for research and a broad variety of animal and plant life which can be observed in its natural habitat.

The station has library facilities and accommodations for the researchers' families. About 45 to 50 persons live at the station during the summer including several who might stay at the camp for only one or two days. The station operates normally from June 1 to Sept. 10.

Clarke says that since 1953, when the University took over direction of the station, it had become a great asset to the university

and has become internationally known among biological scientists.

THE POOR PAY MORE FOR CREDIT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, recently the Federal Trade Commission has issued an excellent report on credit practices of certain retail merchants in the District of Columbia. This report carefully documents what many of us who have fought for truth in lending have long known: The poor do, in fact, pay more.

The report shows how certain credit merchants are able to charge exorbitant prices for inferior or shoddy merchandise and make even greater profits by excessive credit fees. I am hopeful that the truth-in-lending bill will provide some measure of protection for the poor and uninformed in dealing with such merchants.

Exploitation of the poor is becoming one of our most serious national problems. The report of the President's Commission on Civil Disorders makes it abundantly clear that credit exploitation of the poor is one of the reasons contributing to riots and civil disorders.

Mr. President, Mr. Robert C. Maynard of the Washington Post has written two articles concerning the FTC report on the credit practices of retail merchants who sell to the poor. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POOR TAX: CREDIT FEES PILE UP IN SLUMS—I

(By Robert C. Maynard)

Mr. and Mrs. George W. Lowry live at 50 Florida av. nw. Their income hovers around \$350 a month, and they paid a total of \$400, including financing charges, for a used combination phonograph and television set that they thought was new. The Olympic set went on the blink a month after the purchase, they said. A recent check showed that a new Olympic set with full warranty could be purchased for \$244 cash.

(The Lowrys bought their set from Walker-Thomas Furniture Co., 1031 7th st. nw. Walker-Thomas's copy of the contract indicates the firm's cost was \$90 for the set).

Gwendolyn Sellman, whose husband is an \$80-a-week bartender, paid \$313 for a sofa and chair set. The sofa started to collapse less than a month after purchase. A good sofa is available in Georgetown for \$199.

(Mrs. Sellman bought her \$300 sofa and chair from Tops Furniture Co., 1001 H st. ne. The wholesale price was less than \$70 for the five-piece sofa-bed suite.)

This reporter was offered a drab sun-bleached dachon and rayon suit, without label, for \$90.

(Moskins Credit Clothing at 729 7th st. nw. offered the suit. A leading men's store on Connecticut Avenue was selling English wool suits for the same price that day.)

The practices mentioned here are not unusual. Nor are the stores. If anything, they are commonplace in Washington, D.C. But stores like these exist in every major slum in America. Everywhere they operate in much the same way.

These are not the stores that middle-class housewives usually patronize. And they don't sell the same way as do stores that serve the general market. Prices, for instance, almost

always are for the item including financing charges. Cash sales are not encouraged.

High-credit stores sell mainly to poor people, and they usually are in poor neighborhoods, whereas general-market stores do about 26.5 per cent of their trade on credit, according to a Federal Trade Commission study of high-credit stores here. The study was released last week.

Because these stores deal mainly with the poor, they do only 16 per cent of the city's total retail credit business, but the way they affect those with whom they trade is causing great concern. Experts in urban matters feel that their methods aggravate the plight of the poor.

What these stores offer is convenience to people who cannot afford to pay cash for what they feel they need or who, for various reasons, cannot or will not buy at general-market stores, using charge accounts.

"They are paying," one lawyer familiar with the situation says, "a poor tax. It's that simple."

The FTC's study points out that, in general, poor people pay more for inferior merchandise.

The merchants, when they will talk about it, defend their pricing and their sales methods. They have to charge so much, they say, because they have to cover the high rate of loss incurred from bad debts.

A typical criterion for extending credit is whether a prospect has been employed for a year. How many other debts he has, how many mouths he has to feed with how much income, or other measures of his ability to pay are rarely examined. When, as often happens, the store payments are not met, the creditor can repossess the goods, sue the buyer for the unpaid balance of the debt, and garnish his salary. The latter could cost the debtor his job. The item usually is sold again after repossession.

"If I had known this is the way it was going to turn out," said George Lowry the other day, "I sure know we wouldn't have done it. I've learned my lesson now. Never again."

Mr. and Mrs. Lowry were sitting in their sparsely furnished living room, describing their credit ordeal. They said they were paying "just a little a week for stuff we thought we needed."

It began in May of 1965, Annie Lee Lowry remembers. She was home with her five children when Charles Heagy, a door-to-door salesman for Walker-Thomas, came to the door.

Mrs. Lowry had not planned to buy a bed-spread. She didn't need one. But a spread for only \$1 a week?

It always starts that way. It has that subtle rhythm of a changing tide. Just a little at a time. Mrs. Lowry could not have foreseen then the day when she and her husband would owe Walker-Thomas more than \$650.

George Lowry's take-home pay from his job as a cook at a drive-in restaurant in Rockville was \$66 a week. The rent was about \$80 a month. Lowry now says, "A dollar. Why, anybody figures he can get a dollar anywhere."

Mrs. Lowry signed a piece of paper and the thing was hers. The price was \$39 for the blue chenille spread and two matching pillows. It seemed a bargain.

She didn't see salesman Heagy for a while, she said, maybe a few months. Meanwhile, a collection man was coming for her weekly dollar. She paid faithfully.

Mr. Heagy came back a little later with a linen bundle, and there were other items; the weekly tithe was rising, slowly.

George and Annie Lee Lowry took the big plunge in November, 1965. Heagy showed Mrs. Lowry a picture of an Olympic "home entertainment center." Television set, AM-FM radio, a stereo phonograph. They owed only \$42 at that time.

Mrs. Lowry pondered the picture of the set—and she liked it. She and her husband

talked it over. Their payments would go up to \$7 a week—\$7 out of \$66, with seven mouths to feed. George Lowry wasn't so sure.

Heagy called the next day and invited Lowry to the store. Lowry signed the contract for the set. Although the contract states the set was used, Lowry said he thought it was new, a belief he and his wife were to have for months afterward.

"Why don't you come down and get a hide-a-bed set?" These are the words Mrs. Lowry remembers Heagy's saying in November, 1966.

By then, Lowry says, "We didn't want to get anything more from him because we knew he was too high, but we couldn't get any cash together, so . . ."

So Lowry's payments rose to \$18 a week after he bought a convertible couch and chair for \$449, including the financing charges the wholesale cost of the two pieces to Walker-Thomas was \$131.

Now the Lowrys were in trouble. They owed Walker-Thomas more than \$650. And although they had been prompt in their payments, bad fortune struck, and a part-time job Mr. Lowry was holding as a cook had to be abandoned.

"It got down to the point where we couldn't pay the bills," Lowry says simply.

The Lowrys made their last payment to Walker-Thomas on April 20 of last year. By June 20, U.S. Marshals were knocking at the door.

Walker-Thomas had sued for repossession of the sofa-bed and chair, a transistor radio, a television antenna and that \$400 Olympic combination.

The company's claim against the Lowrys at that point was that the couple owed \$508. But the company got a court order to seize the other items, for which the Lowrys had already paid about \$460.

As the Lowrys and others have learned, when a series of items are purchased from Walker-Thomas on credit, the sales contracts provide that no single item is paid for until all have been paid for.

But the Lowrys didn't pay, and, although they had paid for the Olympic set, they thought, Walker-Thomas seized it for their failure to pay for the sofa-bed.

Eventually, George and Annie Lee Lowry recovered their television-phonograph set, with the aid of the Neighborhood Legal Services Project. The sofa-bed was useless by then because it had deteriorated.

The lawyer who worked on the Lowry's defense said afterward:

"The tragedy is that such cases as this happen every day."

Buying a couch, Gwendolyn Sellman remembers, was quite an experience in showmanship for her.

"Oh, he was really far out," she says now of the salesman. "He bounced up and down on the furniture and did all kinds of things to show how sturdy it was."

Less than a month after, the Tops Furniture company delivered her couch and living room chair, in June of 1966, the couch arm began to fall off. Before she and her husband finally gave up trying to deal with Tops, they were using pieces of lumber to shore up their \$313 investment.

Despite their difficulties with the furniture, the Sellmans continued to pay \$14 a month to Tops. Months of telephone calls and letters about the condition of the furniture got no results, Mrs. Sellman said.

Finally, the couch was unsightly and useless. She remembers going to the store and talking to "the man who had bounced up and down and seemed so sincere. He was a completely different person. He didn't seem so nice at all."

MONEY REFUNDED

She went to Neighborhood Legal Services. The money she paid on the couch, more than

\$150, was refunded by Tops more than a year after the purchase.

As for the couch, it still sits in the back of her house and looks like a piece of rubble. She has called Tops to come and get it, "but they never do."

Mrs. Sellman said recently that she had not intended to buy furniture from Tops that day. "I was just looking around," she remembered.

A visit to any one of the nearly two dozen high-credit stores in any of the city's principal slums will make it easier to understand how difficult it is to leave without signing a contract for something.

These stores rely heavily on impulse buying. They also rely a considerable extent on customers' ignorance of the market and the value of merchandise. As the FTC's study pointed out, there is little competition between the high-credit stores.

Prices can be astronomical.

Lawyers, social workers and antipoverty workers have tried to find out why the poor willingly pay so much for inferior goods.

Mr. and Mrs. Lowry felt they had no choice because they are poor and have many needs. Mrs. Sellman said that once the salesman "went into his act," she could not stave off a "yes."

To William O'Brien, who runs a credit union program for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the answer is psychological.

"That man in the credit stores treats people like princes," he said. "He makes a man feel like he's worth something when he is being sold. If that man went downtown to a department store in the old clothes he has, he feels he would be rejected."

There is, for many poor Negroes, a psychological barrier to "downtown."

The door-to-door system is effective because it bridges that barrier. The salesman does two things: He brings the goods to the door and he assures the credit acceptability of the poor.

It never even occurred to George and Annie Lee Lowry to march up to one of the big department stores downtown and ask to open a charge account.

Some of this is habit. The high-credit stores are the traditional shopping places for Negroes, harking back to the days when Negroes were distinctly unwelcome in the city's more posh quarters.

"I remember in some of those department stores, they wouldn't even look at a colored," said one man involved in the high-credit business.

THE POOR TAX: "IT'S EASY, JUST PAY A LITTLE BIT AT A TIME"—II

(By Robert C. Maynard)

The salesman's manner was fatherly and friendly. "Now," he said with a gentle smile, "if you have a choice of paying for something in one great big lump, or paying for it easily, a little at a time, which would you prefer?"

The customer hesitated. It all seemed so nice and simple. "Well, I guess I'd rather pay for it a little at a time." Right answer.

"Of course you would," the salesman said. "Now just sit down here and let's talk a minute."

On the second floor of the New York Jewelry Co., at 719 7th st. n.w., where this conversation took place recently, there was a scattering of inexpensive-looking furniture illuminated by a few naked light bulbs.

It looks something like a bargain basement. And the eagerness of the salesman to sign up the customer encourages the belief that it's easier on the customer to buy on credit.

Neither appearance is a true one, according to charges brought by the staff of the Federal Trade Commission that New York Jewelry's prices are unconscionably high and that it uses "easy credit" to obtain those

prices. The staff was not upheld by a trial examiner and the issue is before the full commission.

Although New York Jewelry is only one of several stores facing FTC charges, the Commission has studied all of Washington's high-credit stores.

According to the FTC's study, issued last week, the stores have sales of \$7 million a year. At some stores, credit sales constitute 100 per cent of their business.

In effect, the FTC found what the stores sell is debt, not merchandise.

Because the customer was always bringing up new objections, the New York Jewelry salesman was having difficulty getting him to agree to open a charge account.

Had the customer not been a reporter, the salesman's job might have been easier.

"I'm sorry if I seem to be firing questions at you like a lawyer," said the salesman, William Cobb, "it's just that there's certain information we have to have. Like where you live and where you work and where your wife works."

In its recent study of credit-merchant operations, the FTC said a "review of credit references . . . revealed that 70 per cent indicated either no credit references or credit references from low-income market retailers only."

Immediately before firing his questions, Cobb had shown some of his wares and determined what his customer seemed interested in buying. This amounted to a bedroom suite, without mattress or box spring, a dinette set and a couch, with odds and ends of living room furniture.

Questions about selection were answered with a wave from Cobb. Everything the customer wants, the customer gets; don't worry about a thing.

When the selection process was finished, Cobb, without visibly adding any figures or detailing the components of his computation, announced simply, "that will be \$407."

"Is that cash or on terms?" the customer wanted to know. The salesman gave him a long and questioning look.

"Well, I just thought maybe I could get the money to pay cash," the customer said.

Still being friendly and gentle, but with a slight air of impatience, Cobb said:

"I think I'm a little older than you, and I can tell you some things. Now, for example, maybe you could pull a chunk of money out of your pocket to pay for something like furniture. But a man has to be able to show he has credit. It's very important to establish credit in a town. You know what I mean."

"Now," Cobb continued, "if you have a choice of paying for something in one great big lump, or paying for it easily, a little bit at a time, which would you prefer?"

The customer said a little at a time was better, of course.

With pencil poised over order book, the salesman began to pursue the information necessary to the opening of an account.

Except for the couch, which he said was \$150, and the dinette set, which carried a tag of \$57, the salesman did not disclose the prices of individual items.

To support its charge of unconscionable prices, the FTC staff charged that New York Jewelry sold for \$59.50 a pair of eyeglasses for which it paid \$3.28 and which an optometrist testified sell generally for \$24, and that the company sold for \$49.50 toasters for which it paid \$5.49.

Trial Examiner Raymond J. Lynch held that the staff had failed to prove its case. He also said there was "nothing unusual" about New York Jewelry's prices.

After the hearing, the FTC broadened its investigation to include all high-credit practices in the city, resulting in the massive study issued last week. Although the study was limited to Washington, Chairman Paul Rand Dixon said the practices, it described, could be found in other cities.

CREDIT PRACTICES

The FTC's study of the District, importantly, was used extensively by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders in its discussion of credit practices.

The Commission said of cities in which riots occurred:

"In some cases, rioters focused on stores operated by white merchants who, they apparently believed, had been charging exorbitant prices or selling inferior goods."

The Kerner Commission went on to say that of the 20 cities that had disturbances that it studied, "significant grievances concerning unfair commercial practices affecting Negro consumers were found in 11."

The fact that most of the merchants are white "undoubtedly contributes to the conclusion among Negroes that they are exploited by white society," it said.

Although none of the operators of the stores on Seventh Street would agree to be interviewed by The Washington Post, one thing is clear from visiting their stores: They are aware of this charge and are making an effort to improve their image by hiring Negroes as salesmen and collectors.

Cobb at New York Jewelry, for example, was a slightly graying, fortyish Negro, who used a fair amount of the ghetto idiom in his conversation.

On 7th Street, where New York Jewelry and many other high-credit merchants are located, Negro salesmen selling to Negroes are a more common sight than they are in other parts of the city.

Rarer are Negro door-to-door salesmen representing the credit merchants. All indications are that most such salesmen are white, although the clientele is overwhelmingly Negro.

SELLING TACTICS OF HIGH-CREDIT STORES

Common methods employed to generate sales among the poor by some high-credit merchants are:

Bait and switch: The price for the couch in the window says "Special—\$99." Inside, the salesman deprecates the quality of that couch and offers "a much better deal," at a higher price, of course.

Easy payment: The price on the suit says it costs \$4.25 a week, but never says for how many weeks or what the total cost will be. Such deals average \$90 for suits that sell for \$60 cash.

Door-to-door collectors: They come to collect each week on a previous sale. As the balance declines, they offer more and more goods that will "just add a couple of dollars to the bill."

Shills: These are men who stand in front of stores, asking, "Need a nice suit today. Nice deal on sweaters." Or perhaps a "free gift if you just step inside." Once inside, the prospect is urged to open an account and make purchases.

Referral system: If you give the names of several friends who buy the product, you'll get yours free. The customer signs an installment contract and ends up paying high-credit prices.

Free home trial: Often on radio programs, firms will promise that customers may call up and have a television delivered on a "home demonstration basis." The "receipt" the housewife signs is a conditional sales contract.

THE ISOLATIONIST TREND

Mr. McGEE, Mr. President, Crosby Noyes, of the Washington Evening Star, wrote yesterday of the obviously growing trend toward isolationism in America, but most particularly in this body. It threatens, he said, the hope of organizing a world peace on the basis of a reasonable equilibrium of power because, if the isolationist trend should ever come

to represent the majority view the whole concert of a balance of world power would go down the drain.

Mr. Noyes' column is one which states the case in good historical perspective. It shows us the importance of Vietnam today, not merely as a nation imperiled by aggression, but as a focal point in our effort to obtain an equilibrium of power in that part of the world. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 14, 1968]

ISOLATIONIST TREND IMPERILS GLOBAL EQUILIBRIUM

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

No one can watch a debate or a committee hearing in the Senate these days without feeling the gravest doubts about the role that this country will be playing in the world from here on.

The trend toward isolationism whose first intimations were noted two years ago has grown immeasurably.

Today, for the first time since World War II there is a strong, articulate and respectable body of opinion among the leaders of this country that would favor the abdication of the United States as a world power. If this body should ever come to represent the majority view, the whole concept of an equilibrium of world power would go down the drain.

The focal point today, of course, is Vietnam, and among those who rate themselves as dissenters, there is a broad spectrum of honesty and logic.

The real trouble with most doves is that so few of them have the courage to face up to the consequences of the policies they recommend. They dwell interminably on the difficulties and frustrations and ugliness involved in fighting the war. But they almost never admit that the alternative to success is defeat—a defeat which will certainly not be limited to Vietnam itself.

Specifically, what they do not admit is that an American defeat will be followed by a Communist takeover in Vietnam and a general withdrawal of American power from the Asian continent. They profess to doubt that this will lead to a general collapse of resistance to Communist pressure—immediately in Laos and Cambodia, a little later in Thailand, Burma, Malaysia and ultimately quite probably in Indonesia, India, Korea, Taiwan, the Philippines and Japan.

The majority of dissenters in the Senate reject these probabilities as red herrings conjured up by supporters of the war.

Sen. Eugene McCarthy, for instance, talks at times of "liquidating" our commitments in Asia. But at other times he also talks of drawing a new line in Thailand against Communist pressures. For Majority Leader Mike Mansfield, Vietnam is simply the wrong war in the wrong place.

Almost all the critics claim to be against "unilateral withdrawal" of American forces. But they also firmly deny the possibility of an American "victory" in Vietnam, implying a face-saving compromise which will leave the Communists in effective control of the country.

Then again, there is the theory, spelled out this week to Dean Rusk by Chairman Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, that it is the presence of American power in Asia itself which is responsible for the instability of the area.

According to this thesis, "our own intrusion into Southeast Asia has incited" the Communist regimes in Peking and Hanoi to bring pressure to bear on their neighbors. The im-

plication is clear that if only American power were completely withdrawn from Asia, the threat of Communist aggression would simply disappear.

Some, indeed, have the honesty to call openly for withdrawal. In the course of last week's Senate debate, Idaho's Sen. Frank Church remarked that he had served in Asia during World War II.

"I came away," he said, "persuaded that Asia is an endless morass and that the day of Western control of Asian affairs had passed. In the years since, we have seen all the other Western nations driven from Asia one by one. We are the last to keep a foothold on the mainland of Asia."

So far as Sen. Church is concerned, Asia is a "baited trap" where "legions of young Americans are being beckoned to their graves." Like a good many of his liberal colleagues, he apparently feels that our commitments to the free nations of Asia are in some way less valid or have less importance to world peace than our commitments in other parts of the world.

In all this there is, of course, an unstated implication. It is that if communism becomes the prevailing system in Asia, we might all be the better off for it. Then, at any rate, the problems of this vast and complicated continent would not be ours to cope with. And if the Communists should succeed in bringing order and prosperity to the area, more power to them.

Those who believe this at least have the virtue of following the logic of dissent on the war in Vietnam to an honest conclusion. For if defeat in Vietnam is followed by a withdrawal from Asia—or from any other part of the world—the effect would be precisely the same as if American power had ceased to exist.

The hope of organizing world peace on the basis of a reasonable equilibrium of power would then be definitively scrapped. And our policy would be based on a hope of buying peace by dishonoring our commitments and surrendering nearly a billion Asians to the most ruthless tyranny that men have ever devised.

SELF-RELIANCE FOR INDIANS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, on March 7, I spoke in the Senate to respond to President Johnson's message concerning the plight of the American Indian. At that time, I had occasion to criticize past policies of paternalism and "termination."

I also spoke out against the "topheavy and inefficient" bureaucracy which has, up to now, supposedly been helping the Indians. The President's message promises more bureaucratic "wheel-spinning." What must be emphasized, Mr. President, is full responsibility for Indians—with the assistance of the Federal Government where appropriate—responsibility for the determination of their own affairs and their own lives.

The Rocky Mountain News, of Denver, Colo., echoed many of these views in an editorial entitled "L. B. J. and the Indians." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this timely, blunt editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

L. B. J. AND THE INDIANS

The country already is beset by costly programs it hardly can tackle in full scope—at least until the top problem, Vietnam, is brought to hand.

So now comes a special presidential message, the first ever, on the Indian problem

which has been with us for years. The Government has an Indian Affairs Bureau and a half dozen or more departments theoretically concerned with helping Indians. None of this has amounted to much more than a wheel-spinning bureaucracy.

Mr. Johnson says the aims of his program (which naturally means more spending, although only a half-billion in this case) is to provide "partnership, not paternalism" for the native Indian.

Paternalism, on the whole, has not done much for the Indians. And it isn't "partnership" they really need, whatever that is.

What they ought to have is the same opportunity and citizen rating as everybody else. They should be treated as Americans, not as a group aside. The same as any other people, no matter what their racial backgrounds.

Mr. Johnson says the plight of the Indians "dwarfs the situation of any other Americans in the worst ghettos." Which raises the question of what the Bureau of Indian Affairs and other involved Government agencies have been doing with their money for these many years.

The President also appointed another committee to look after the Indians, who need a committee like they need a bucket of war paint. What they need is the freedom and self-reliance to do for themselves, and if Mr. Johnson's message gets something started in this direction it is pretty late, but better than never.

WHERE THE EAGLES SOAR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, Life magazine for March 15 has published a beautiful spread of color pictures of areas in southern Utah and northern Arizona. The one that appears at the center of the magazine is entitled "Splendors Where the Eagles Soar." It is a color photograph of the Arches National Monument, with the La Sal Mountains in the background. Many times I have seen this scene from the air and on the ground and I can attest to its accuracy, as well as its beauty. On the following page, are two remarkable photographs of Bryce Canyon National Park. I am sure that the formations look quite unbelievable to those who have not seen this fantastic area. I might go on and comment about the subsequent pages, but I will restrict myself simply to saying that the beauties here are only a very small part of those that are to be seen in the marvelous Four Corners area in which lie Canyonlands National Park, Arches National Monument, Natural Bridges National Monument, Glen Canyon National Recreation Area, Grand Canyon National Park, Zion National Park, and Bryce Canyon National Park. There are other monuments, like Rainbow Bridge and Capitol Reef, as well as beauties to be seen on the Indian reservation there. I commend Life magazine most highly for this beautiful spread and congratulate them on their campaign to "See America." In a year when we are doing our utmost to rectify the balance-of-payments deficit and expending our efforts encouraging our own people to see America and encouraging foreigners to come to our shores, this is a noteworthy assist.

VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, if one spent his days listening to the gloom forecast-

ers, one might well get the idea that all is bleak with regard to the situation in Southeast Asia. But it is not. There is great danger, however, in the mood of people who would have us, in effect, accept defeat—defeat which would certainly result from acceptance of what columnist Joseph Alsop calls one of the “crazier halfway house solutions” to the Vietnam war being proposed today by critics of the administration. If we were to accept these proposals and follow through, he writes:

Salon will be ruled from Hanoi in a very short space of time.

What the consequences would be here at home should be a terrifying thought to all of us, and this, too, is a subject of Mr. Alsop's column in this morning's Washington Post. As anyone can see, there is already acute danger of the most frightening return to the right in this country. It would be tremendously heightened by the first defeat in war of American arms.

Considering the facts in Vietnam today, including the very high enemy casualty rate, we should not need to be considering what Mr. Alsop calls halfway house solutions. I ask unanimous consent that the Alsop column, published in today's Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO HALFWAY HOUSE BETWEEN VICTORY,
DEFEAT IN VIETNAM

(By Joseph Alsop)

In the prevailing fog of gloom and uncertainty, there are only two things that can be said with perfect certainty about the war in Vietnam. The first is bleakly simple.

There is in fact no comfortable, easy halfway house between defeat and victory.

No one who has studied North Vietnamese policy, labored to read the captured documents, and followed on the spot the development of Hanoi's war plans, tactics and strategy, believes for one moment that such a halfway house exists today, or will ever exist in the future. The well-intentioned people who offer theoretical blueprints for such halfway houses are as ignorant of the realities as the people who used to peddle the view that Josef Stalin was really a nice guy at heart.

The North Vietnamese leaders are men with a tenacity and courage that seem all the more admirable in the present climate in Washington. They are also men endowed with the most steely ruthlessness. In the month of February, they expended their troops at a rate of more than 10,000 men a week and in the week of March 2 to March 9, they were still expending troops so lavishly that their losses exceeded 6700 men—and this is without counting their wounded!

Take as their population base the 16,500,000 people of North Vietnam, plus the 5,000,000 plus-or-minus under V.C. control in the south. Make the appropriate conversion. You find that the Hanoi leaders are in fact accepting losses which, if accepted by the United States of America, would run from 60,000 to 100,000 men a week in killed-in-action alone.

They are accepting these quite unprecedented rates of loss—10 times as high as the average in the recent past—because they are going for broke—trying to win the war in a short time—because they know they cannot stand the strain of greatly prolonged war. And they are ready to make such appalling

sacrifices because they want to get their grip on South Vietnam.

To get their grip on South Vietnam at cheaper cost, the Hanoi leaders might well accept one or another of the crazier halfway house solutions that have been proposed in this country. But if that is ever permitted to happen, Saigon will be ruled from Hanoi in a very short space of time.

All the millions of Vietnamese who have put their faith in the United States will then suffer cruelly for this misplaced faith. The U.S. will also have experienced its first defeat in war since this Republic was established. And that leads to the second certainty in the present situation, which is also bleak and simple.

Feeble, needless acceptance of defeat in Vietnam will poison American political life for a generation or more.

The circumstances that produced the terrible McCarthy-time were down-right trivial, compared to the hideous circumstances that will confront this country after acceptance of the defeat in Vietnam. The resulting outcry about “stabs-in-the-back,” the search for scapegoats, the accusations of disloyalty and worse, can in truth be expected to make the McCarthy-time seem downright cozy in retrospect.

Considering how obvious this ought to be, one is all but driven to conclude that the American Left has gone collectively insane. As anyone should be able to see, there is already acute danger of the most frightening sort of a turn to the right in this country. The extreme postures of the Negro racists and the trouble in the cities are quite enough to provide such a rightward turn.

The President's riot commission was no more than realistic, when it warned of the possibility of American apartheid. That risk, God knows, will be hard enough to circumvent, and that problem will be hard enough to solve, without the added poisons that are sure to be engendered by the first defeat in war in American history. Add these other poisons to the present mix, and the American future hardly bears contemplation!

Without regard to the wisdom or unwisdom of past decisions, there is therefore only one safe course to take. That course is to make the needed effort to win the war. Winning does not mean crushing North Vietnam, and it does not demand the measures proposed by men like General Curtis LeMay. Winning means no more than forcing the Hanoi leaders to call home their troops, and to cease threatening their neighbors in Laos and South Vietnam.

As any rational man should be able to see from the loss rates and population figures cited above, the Hanoi leaders cannot imaginably sustain the kind of effort they are now making for a very long time. If you go for broke and fail, the failure leaves you broken. Hence there is nothing hopeless in the present situation; but because of the American advocates of defeat-at-any-price, there is profound danger for the American future.

ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE ENDORSES CONCEPT OF NATION-WIDE EMERGENCY UNIVERSAL NUMBERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this morning it was my privilege to address via telephone those present in Philadelphia, Pa., attending a consultation on the use of telephones in emergency situations. The consultation had been arranged by the Franklin Institute Research Laboratories.

We appear to be moving toward the implementation of congressional resolutions calling for uniform nationwide emergency telephone numbers. Break-

throughs of enormous importance are taking place since the organizations concerned with emergency telephones and their uses are talking and working together.

The Alaska State Legislature endorsed a resolution relating to the uniform fire and police reporting telephone numbers last week. It is, to the best of my knowledge, the first State legislature to take such positive action. As the resolution pointed out, universal emergency numbers, such as I have suggested in Senate Concurrent Resolution 50, “can be regarded as a start in offering all citizens the emergency security of knowing immediately how to get help in any crisis in any part of the United States.”

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my remarks this morning be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you, Dr. Spillhaus.

My remarks this morning are possible because of man's scientific knowledge, know-how, and the proper application of this knowledge and competence by the employees of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. They have made this program possible. I am pleased to have this opportunity to acknowledge their assistance and to thank them for bringing about this historic occasion.

My regret is that we are not yet at the stage of scientific advancement in which one literally will be transported to Philadelphia in an instant and deposited in Franklin Hall and later beamed back to the Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C., when the session ends. However, considering the fantastic advancement of our scientific knowledge, this undoubtedly will be possible before the turn of the century.

Your principal goal today, to define the technical problems of quick, emergency dialing—and to solve these problems—is impressive. It should be. You can develop, in addition to this most welcome dialogue, the means to help every American. And there are 200 million of us. We would like to save precious minutes and seconds in times of emergency. We welcome your help as we work toward a solution.

Perhaps our goal will be realized through the use of separate emergency telephone numbers.

Perhaps the goal will be realized by dialing one emergency telephone number after which the caller's specific need is separated electronically and speeded to the proper service.

Perhaps our goal of the quickest possible response will be solved in yet another way which at this time is unclear or unknown.

The real breakthrough today, I believe, is the fact that we are here, talking together, ready and willing to pool our knowledge.

I am not a scientist. Most of you, perhaps all of you in Franklin Hall, are much more qualified to discuss the “how” and “why” of the problem and decide “what” can be done to ensure speedy dissemination of emergency calls.

In our highly developed and urbanized society we are plagued by far too many horse and buggy problems. We have the technological ability to send space probes past the planets Mars, Venus, and no doubt beyond Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, and Pluto. We are taking steps to land men on the Moon—and beyond—worthy project which compliment our scientific ability.

We can send 30-story objects into orbit. Surely then, we have the ability to perfect a nationwide system which makes it possible for citizens to report emergency calls. On

previous occasions I have said that the perfection of such a system could be the basis for an international network of the future. We can make programs like "The Man from UNCLE" and "Get Smart" as old-fashioned as Orphan Annie and her decoder pin.

We need not wait for inexpensive laser beams. We could look now at existing unused equipment. Have we really considered centralized dispatching? What about equipment available now which is used only once-in-a-while?

The time for concern is now. Our population growth continues. The problems which plague 200 million Americans today will plague 400 million Americans by the turn of the century. We had better be prepared for more and bigger emergencies. The jurisdictional problems of today may well be more complex.

We must talk to each other now. And we must talk aloud. Further, we must act.

Many men and women who are concerned about this problem of speedy responses to emergency calls have written to me. Some have called. Some have stopped by the office. I won't repeat their suggestions, but I will say that one person asked why it would not be possible to expand and develop existing equipment which identifies the telephone number making a toll call?

Hopefully, you will have the answer. Perhaps it is a possible starting point.

I want to tell you a little bit about what I have done.

On November 1, 1967, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 50. This is the text of the resolution:

"Resolved by the Senate (The House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should have one uniform nationwide fire reporting telephone number and one uniform nationwide police reporting telephone number."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] is a cosponsor. Identical proposed legislation has been introduced in the House of Representatives.

Congressman J. Edward Roush of Indiana who will also speak to you is the "father" of this proposal. He has come to believe that one single emergency number is better, and perhaps, he is correct. I do know that we have to find the answer.

On January 12, 1968, I wrote to Senator Warren G. Magnuson, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, to request that hearings be held on the problem. Chairman Magnuson is deeply concerned about consumer problems. He has assured me that the Committee will consider my request.

As you know, a single, uniform emergency number for use by public safety agencies and many communities served by the Associated Bell System has been proposed by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company.

You may have read the editorial in the March 1, 1968 issue of Life magazine entitled "Dial 911 for Help". Those three digits—9-1-1—have been freed by the American Telephone and Telegraph Company for emergency use. The cost to the company is estimated at \$50 million dollars. You will hear about the proposal this morning. I hope you will let company representatives know how you feel about the implementation of the proposal.

According to Life magazine, the United States of America this year has half the telephones in the world. Would it not be proper, then, for us, by example, to find a fast way to answer distress calls and to share our solution with other nations.

But the solution "on paper" must be implemented. When a man's home is on fire, he needs help in the quickest possible time.

A woman walking down the street may suddenly need assistance to help someone lying unconscious on the sidewalk. Let us add that her only immediate assistant is a nearby

telephone booth. She has a dollar bill and three pennies in her purse.

I think you realize what her problems will be.

I want to tell you two true stories.

The first concerns some wonderful, public-spirited men and women.

Frankly, I was concerned when I learned that the Bell three-digit proposal had been announced before the proposal had been communicated to all public safety agencies concerned. I asked numerous organizations and agencies to meet with me. We set up an informal Ad Hoc Committee representing the Nation's police chiefs and fire chiefs, the Bell Telephone Company, and the U.S. Independent Telephone Association. The Ad Hoc Committee began to explore ways in which citizens could best report emergency problems.

I am told it was the first time all the groups had met together. Let me now thank the men who are serving on that committee:

Its chairman, David Gratz, chief of the Silver Spring, Maryland, Fire Department, who also represents the International Association of Fire Chiefs;

Mr. Roger Reinke, assistant director, Field Operations, International Association of Chiefs of Police;

Mr. John Parkhurst, executive assistant, American Telephone and Telegraph Company; and

Mr. Herbert H. Butler, secretary, U.S. Independent Telephone Association.

Attending the first of the informal Ad Hoc meetings were also representatives of the Alaska Communications System, Bell Telephone System, Federal Communications Commission, International Association of Fire Fighters, National Sheriffs Association, and many local police and fire departments.

One man we may all honor especially was present—Mr. Joe Giammatteo, volunteer fire chief of the Glen Echo, Maryland, fire department, the first person known to have recommended that there be an emergency fire reporting telephone number.

The Ad Hoc Committee will be extremely interested in your work this day in Philadelphia.

The second true story I wish to tell concerns the State Legislature of Alaska which last week endorsed my Senate Concurrent Resolution 50 and recommended its national implementation.

To the best of my knowledge the State Legislature of my state of Alaska is the first state legislature officially to endorse the concept.

Alaska State Representative Gene Guess, of Anchorage, introduced House Joint Resolution No. 62 on February 13, 1968. It was a resolution relating to the uniform fire and police reporting telephone numbers.

Here is the text of State Representative Guess's resolution:

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas, on November 1, 1967, Senator Ernest Gruening submitted a resolution in the United States Senate in support of the adoption of one uniform nationwide fire reporting telephone number and one uniform police reporting telephone number; and

"Whereas these universal numbers would hardly resolve the problems which confront people in an emergency situation, but they do provide a workable tool which can be regarded as a start in offering all citizens the emotional security of knowing immediately how to get help in any crisis in any part of the United States; and

"Whereas this proposal deserves the support of all safety conscious citizens interested in a simple and efficient way to improve the safety of our society;

Be it resolved, that the Legislature of the State of Alaska endorses Senator Gruening's

proposal and recommends its national implementation."

This resolution passed the House unanimously and then was approved by the State Senate by a vote of 17 yeas to 2 nays.

I am very proud of the members of the Alaska State Legislature and I hope their desire to improve the safety of our society will serve as a catalyst to us all.

Uniform nationwide fire reporting and police reporting telephone numbers will not end riots, eradicate criminals, nor prevent fires, but they would provide sensible tools which could make it possible to save a burning home or apartment house or let local police authorities know when and where they are needed. Perhaps, more important, such uniform numbers could put into the hands of every member of our highly mobile society positive ways to improve its safety.

Time is life and time is money. The first, once gone, cannot be replaced.

If funding is needed for the research and development of emergency service consoles which in fractions of seconds could separate and route police and fire and ambulance calls, then it may be necessary for the federal government and private enterprise to provide it.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak to you.

SUBSCRIPTION TELEVISION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, subscription television is now ready for launching on a national scale. I hope the Federal Communications Commission will act soon to make this additional option available to the American public.

Today subscription television is on the threshold of becoming a national reality. Yet, for the moment this new, legitimate business has been excluded from the marketplace.

As I understand it subscription television is not asking for special protection. It is not asking for Government subsidy. It is not asking for unique privileges. Today subscription television is asking only for the opportunity to offer its service to the public.

It is asking for the opportunity to compete against the present television programs. It is asking that the viewer be given the chance to add to his program choices with a new method of paying for them, if that be his wish.

It would be difficult for anyone who believes in the free enterprise system, in the contributions of competition to the American way of life and in the consumer's right to choose, to find anything unreasonable in subscription television's appeal.

For 6 years subscription television has been undergoing a thorough practical experiment in Hartford, Conn. There the technological breakthroughs in the laboratory have been applied to permit this new supplemental system to add to the already existing commercial television supported by advertising.

The Hartford experiment has given the Federal Communications Commission the information it was seeking when it authorized the test. It has apparently demonstrated that a subscription television system is technically feasible, that there is a public demand for it, and it has indicated the conditions under which subscription televi-

sion can operate as an important supplement to existing systems.

The Hartford test was neither designed nor expected to establish finally the economic viability of subscription television—a single test in one market the size of Hartford could not have done so.

Today some 5,000 set owners in Hartford are subscription television participants who have opted to pay a monthly premium to have this added dimension of entertainment and education in their homes.

For the past 20-plus years, advertising has been the principal means of support for programs carried on the major networks and on the local commercial stations. No doubt it will continue to be so in the future. But predominate reliance on television paid for by the viewers' purchases of advertised products must not be allowed to rule out the attractive additional alternative of permitting the viewer, if he wishes, to sponsor additional program possibilities by subscription methods. This alternative broadens the medium and gives the viewing public added options both in the selection of programs it wishes to see and the manner in which it wishes to pay for them.

I am not being critical of existing advertising-supported programming. Like every viewer I find some programs far more interesting, entertaining, or valuable than others, but on the whole I am impressed with the thoroughness of coverage and the high caliber of much of the television fare paid for by advertising.

This is the more amazing when we consider the obvious limitations against which advertiser-sponsored television must work. With some notable but limited exceptions, programs have to be cast to attract the broadest possible audience. Programs aimed at selective audiences seldom enjoy long runs. Every season fine programs which have not developed this appeal to mass audiences are dropped by advertisers who cannot justify the staggering costs of the media unless they reach an impressive percentage of viewers who then purchase the products being advertised.

The economics of advertiser-sponsored television frustrate the maximum potential of the medium and the development of a viable and vigorous UHF system. Working outside these limitations, subscription television adds importantly to television's ability to enlighten and to entertain. It recognizes that neither all homes nor all individuals within each home have uniform tastes or desires for programming.

Additionally—and it is an important addition—subscription television presents a much-needed revenue source for many marginal stations which are now struggling to stay on the air.

I believe Congress intended and should continue to support a dynamic system of broadcasting that will evolve, expand, and progress in response to the dynamics of new developments and an expanding economy. The system should not be wed to old and obsolete technologies. It should constantly strive to expand and diversify its economic sources—thus, to better serve the public with evermore diversified and meaningful programs and

to serve the industry with new sources of revenue for growth.

It was logical and necessary for broadcasting to begin with the technology then available. It would have been ridiculous to have confined broadcasting for all times to AM radio or to protect it forever from the possible adverse impacts of new elements, such as FM and television. In communications, the new never entirely obsolesces the old. Indeed, in most cases, they combine with each other into an ever-evolving, expanding, flexible, and more valuable system.

It would have been unrealistic in the early days of television to have denied it the support of advertisers as some then suggested. Advertising at that point in television's development was the only substantial economic support available. But it would be just as unrealistic to forever confine television's economic sources to advertisers.

As a result of technological innovations, we now have a perfected and proven means by which the public can support a whole new dimension of television.

The Hartford test has yielded much valuable information which has encouraged the Federal Communications Commission to allow STV to enter the marketplace under regulatory conditions which will avoid the adverse effects its opponents feared. The proposal the Commission now has under consideration provides that subscription television broadcasting would be permitted only in communities served by five or more television stations only one of which would be authorized to broadcast subscription programs. The rule is replete with safeguards designed to guarantee that subscription broadcasters will not siphon away programs from the advertiser-sponsored television. For example, movies may not be shown more than 2 years after the date of general release, serial-type programs are prohibited, and no sports event may be shown which has been on free television within the preceding 2 years.

The proposed regulations of the Commission seem more than adequate to assure that the public will not have to "pay for what it now gets free" as opponents of subscription television have alleged.

Instead, through STV, the viewer can be offered entertainment and enlightenment which either he must now leave home to see or are not available to him by any means. Moreover, the development of subscription television broadcasting will not occur suddenly or in a brief period of time, even in the major markets, and I am confident the Commission and the Congress will have ample opportunity to observe the growth of this new system of broadcasting and to take whatever regulatory or legislative action experience may indicate is required to insure that it operates in the public interest.

The Hartford operation commenced on June 29, 1962, with 188 subscribers and reached its test goal of approximately 5,000 subscribers by the end of the second year, and the number of subscribers has been maintained since then at a number hovering between 5,000 and 6,000.

Hartford subscribers have selectively viewed an average of approximately one subscription program per week and have spent an average of \$1.20 per week on the subscription program selected.

The proponents of subscription television believe that the response of the public in Hartford supports a conclusion that subscription television could be made economically viable business on a nationwide basis. Is it relevant that a number of private entrepreneurs have been sufficiently impressed with the results of that trial to be willing to risk millions of dollars in establishing a nationwide system. So long as the public is protected in its present service, as the Commission proposes, these entrepreneurs are entitled to take this risk. This is the very essence of our free enterprise system.

An interesting fact disclosed by the Hartford trial is that the subscribers came from the lower middle rather than the upper economic classes. Approximately 85 percent of the Hartford subscribers had incomes of less than \$10,000 per year, and approximately 50 percent had income of less than \$7,000 per year.

The attraction of subscription television to these lower-middle income groups is not surprising, since its greatest value may be to those who cannot afford to hire babysitters, leave their homes and pay high prices at the theater or sports arena to see what subscription television can provide at a fraction of the cost. For example, current motion pictures shown on subscription television in Hartford range between 50 cents and \$1.50, and an entire family and friends watch the film at this single charge, generally less than the wait-in-line cost of a single admission at the theater.

It is not surprising, in light of the strong interest in subscription television shown by the lower-middle income groups in Hartford, representing the so-called blue-collar worker, that the AFL-CIO changed its 1957 opposition to subscription television to endorsement in 1967.

I am satisfied that the Commission's statutory authority is ample to approve subscription television. There is strong support from judicial precedent as well as the majority view among lawyers who have seriously studied the jurisdictional question. But in view of the challenges to the proposed Commission action by private interests who wish to keep STV out of the marketplace, I am sure that any Commission action would be judicially reviewed and the jurisdictional question permanently put to rest.

Of course, in delegating authority to the Commission, Congress does not foreclose action at any time the Congress sees fit. We are ultimately in control and will remain so regardless of any action taken by the Commission or by the Courts.

The public has the right to expect the benefits of new technologies whether these benefits be lower cost or a greater variety in programming. This new medium can bring into the home sports, educational and cultural events, opera, Broadway shows, live ballet, medical lectures, Shakespeare, and first-run movies to supplement those events which the

viewer may actually prefer to leave the home to see.

Also, for those people who do not have the opportunity of attending the Metropolitan Opera, legitimate theater, or the Wagner Festival in Bayreuth, STV is a means of permitting them to do so in their own homes at a nominal cost.

Subscription television moreover provides an exciting potential of economic support for noncommercial television. It will offer a means through which tuition could be charged for some courses in instructive television. Also, public broadcasting might take a lesson from our motion picture industry, which produces many films, the cost of which advertising television alone cannot bear. So, the films are released first to theaters and STV, and, after box-office revenues have been substantially exhausted, the films are released to conventional television for distribution without direct charge to the viewer. Public television aspires to produce cultural and enrichment programs of similar quality, many of which, I believe, could earn revenue from STV on their initial release, thus recouping a substantial part of their cost and, then, made available for free distribution over conventional ETV operations.

Indeed, where ETV stations have unused air time, which many of them do, I see no reason why they should not be permitted to lease that time to STV entrepreneurs for conventional types of STV programs. They would thus establish an economic source that would reduce their reliance upon public and private grants.

Subscription television has the potential ability to make two significant contributions: First, it can add—as a supplement—a new dimension of programming which is not otherwise available on television; and second, in providing this new source of programs and revenue, it can help accomplish the objectives of our national policy formulated by Congress and the FCC of supporting the widest number of local television stations. This can be done if STV conducts itself within the letter and the spirit of the Commission's rules and of the Communications Act; but even then, only if it provides a distinctive new service which the public wants and is willing to support.

So long as there are products to sell and advertisers eager to sell them, we need never worry about a decline in the number of advertising-sponsored programs available to the viewing public. But there is on the horizon today this exciting new dimension, this important addition to what is now available called subscription television.

Certainly this matter is ripe for decision. Subscription television three times has been the subject of hearings before the House. It has been the subject of hearings before the Senate. It was the subject of exhaustive hearings before the FCC. Further, jurisdictional arguments have been considered at every judicial level up to and including the Supreme Court of the United States.

There are few subjects which have been more thoroughly discussed, debated, and tested at all appropriate legislative, executive, and judicial levels.

I hope the Federal Communications

Commission will act soon to take advantage of the technological advances which have made subscription television possible and to serve the demonstrated public desire which makes it practical.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RIOT COMMISSION'S REPORT

Mr. HART. Mr. President a very perceptive editorial on the need for strong implementation of the Riot Commission's recommendations appeared in last Friday's Washington Post.

As a Senator who has had the unfortunate experience of witnessing first hand the havoc wrought upon Detroit by last summer's riot, I heartily second the Post's call for prompt firm implementation of the Riot Commission's recommendations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD last Friday's Washington Post editorial, entitled "Beyond Politics."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEYOND POLITICS

When President Johnson summoned a dozen of the busiest citizens in the United States to devote themselves for the better part of a year to a study of civil disorders and their causes, he said to them: "Let your search be free . . . As best you can, find the truth and express it in your report. This matter is far, far too important for politics."

The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders went to work with a will and submitted its report, ahead of schedule, a full fortnight ago—a report acclaimed by this newspaper editorially, and by many others, as "a distinguished, powerful and potentially useful document." The Commission's sponsor, President Johnson, was, however, not quite so carried away. Without endorsing the Commission's detailed and practical recommendations, he praised it moderately and called its report "one of the most thorough and exhaustive studies ever made." No photographs of the President receiving the report. No special message concerning it to Congress. No speech to the Nation soliciting attention to its shocking revelations or its stern imperatives. No real guidance to an anxious public in need of strong leadership if the Commission's findings are to be translated into programs and policies.

The Vice President of the United States, Hubert Humphrey, like a former Vice President, Richard Nixon, focused some attention on the Commission's shortcomings. He thought it was too severe in saying that "our Nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal." He seemed to feel that the Commission had given too little credit to the past accomplishments of the Administration in advancing racial equality. The White House said of this that the Vice President was speaking only for himself.

In hailing the Commission report as "potentially useful," we had in mind the vital necessity of presidential action to support it. The Commission fulfilled its function: it found the truth and expressed it. It would be tragic to have so searching and resourceful a report filed and forgotten. It is, indeed, far, far too important for politics.

THE FACTS ABOUT OUR VIETNAM FOLLY ARE FINALLY REACHING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a very knowledgeable and penetrating report,

entitled "Stalemate in Vietnam," has been made to the Committee on Foreign Relations by my able and distinguished colleague, JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, who has recently returned from a visit there.

While I would not agree with this report in every detail, I commend him for making it and I certainly share the view expressed in his conclusions in the following paragraphs:

Our national unity is seriously threatened by the divisiveness caused by deeply held conflicting opinions about the war. Democracy, to be successful, needs an underlying consensus on matters of principle. This we learned from the controversy over slavery at the time of the Civil War. The political fabric of our society is at the tearing point. The traditional democratic concept of alternatives being presented to the voters sufficiently within a national consensus to permit the maintenance of law and order no matter who wins is no longer accepted by a large segment of our society. The divisiveness over Vietnam is running deeper every day.

Vietnam is a cancer which is devouring our youth, our morals, our national wealth, and the energies of our leadership. The casualty list from this war only begins on the battlefield. As victims we must also count the programs of the Great Society, the balance of payments, a sound budget, a stable dollar, the world's good will, détente with the Soviet Union, and hopes for a durable world peace. The toll of this war can never be measured in terms of lives lost and dollars spent—they are only the tip of a vast iceberg whose bulk can never be accurately measured.

Senator CLARK also added his view that—

The war in Vietnam is at a stalemate which neither side can convert into a military victory without leaving the country—and perhaps the world—in ruins.

I would not share the view that the war is a stalemate. I would say that on the contrary we have been losing it steadily ever since we engaged in it and the reasons for that belief can be summarized as follows:

First. We have to date lost about 18,000 fine young Americans killed in combat. They are irreplaceable and their loss is an unmitigated tragedy.

Second. We have lost considerable additional numbers, though not killed in combat, through plane accidents, the bombing of our own people by our military, disease, and so forth.

Third. Over 125,000 of our boys have been wounded, some of them horribly crippled for life, blinded, armless, legless, paralyzed.

Fourth. The war is costing us approximately \$3 billion a month and as a result, our pressing domestic programs, long overdue—education, health, welfare, resource development, housing slum clearance, the war on poverty, the war on crime—are being steadily eroded. With the recently proposed austerity program, they will be still further eroded. This is an incalculable loss which can never be compensated for.

Fifth. We have forfeited the good opinion of most of mankind. Except for some token commitments, we are going it all alone.

Sixth. To date neither the Russian nor the Chinese Communists have committed a single soldier to combat. Yet we are down there, hopelessly and increasingly

bogged down in an Asian land war, fighting a primitive people whose desire is for the independence of their country and the cessation of all foreign interference—whether it be by Chinese, Japanese, French, or Americans. Their history and their present tenacity demonstrate this.

Seventh. The alleged objective of installing democracy in South Vietnam is a grotesque farce. We are supporting, and have been supporting ever since we injected ourselves into Vietnam, military dictatorships, corrupt, grafting officials who pursue the tactics of totalitarianism, and are totally uninterested in the welfare of their people. They are indulging in oppressive tactics, such as the jailing without trial of their opponents, which has gone on in varying degrees ever since we placed the money and might of the United States behind them.

Eighth. Whenever the administration policy is challenged, its spokesmen refer to our "commitments." Those commitments are nonexistent as has been repeatedly proved. The closest thing to a commitment is the promise made repeatedly during the presidential campaign that we would not send American boys to fight a ground war on the continent of Asia where Asian boys should be fighting.

An excellent analysis and rebuttal of these official contentions found in a publication sponsored by the District of Columbia branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom and prepared by Judith A. Hamburg for the Committee on Youth Education for Peace.

I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful analysis of the pros and cons be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A REBUTTAL TO THE ADMINISTRATION'S CONTENTIONS CONCERNING VIETNAM

Today opposition to U.S. policy in Vietnam is being expressed by citizens from all walks of life. Seldom has there been the depth of controversy over an issue that there is concerning the Vietnamese war. Therefore, it is important for people to hear not only the arguments "for" U.S. involvement, but also the arguments "against" U.S. involvement.

Those who oppose U.S. policy in Vietnam would agree with U.N. Secretary General U Thant when he said, "I am sure that the great American people, if only they know the true facts and the background developments in South Vietnam, will agree with me that further bloodshed is unnecessary."

When asked "Why" the U.S. is involved in Vietnam, the U.S. policy makers have given three main reasons:

- (1) We are fighting to preserve freedom.
- (2) We must honor a solemn commitment.
- (3) We must stop aggression.

The dissenters disagree with all three of these contentions. They say that the facts show: the U.S. has supported those who have suppressed freedom rather than preserved it; the conflict is the combined result of a civil war, social revolution, and a war for independence rather than external aggression; instead of honoring commitments, the U.S. has broken them.

IS THE UNITED STATES PRESERVING FREEDOM?

To understand why the dissenters say the U.S. has suppressed freedom we must look at the history of Vietnam and the type of "freedom" the U.S. supported in that history.

The Vietnamese have a pride in their history as a people who have fought many times for their independence against various foreigners who have occupied their country.

After fighting Chinese domination for a thousand years, the Vietnamese finally succeeded in gaining their independence.

But again the Vietnamese were dominated by foreigners when the French took control of Vietnam in the mid-19th century and made it a colony.

French control lasted for some eighty years until Japan seized Vietnam in World War II. During this war the U.S. sought and received the help of the Nationalist Vietnamese leader, Ho Chi Minh, in fighting the Japanese. The U.S. supplied Ho's forces with advisors and arms, openly recognizing Ho as leader of the free Indochina movement.

During this period President Franklin Roosevelt favored the idea of Vietnam becoming independent instead of returning to French domination.

Fight for independence

After the war, Ho Chi Minh briefly gained an agreement with France that Vietnam would become an independent country. But the Frenchmen, who had great vested interest in Vietnam, did not want to give up their colony. Therefore, a long, costly war followed in which the French were driven out of Vietnam. In this war some Vietnamese fought on the side of the French because they had privileges to gain under French rule. But most of the Vietnamese fought for independence under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh's Vietminh forces. The Vietminh was made up of both communist and non-communist Vietnamese. By 1954, the Vietminh had won control of 3/4 of Vietnam when the French finally surrendered.

The question now is what role did the U.S. play during this time. Did the U.S. support the independence of the Vietnamese? Unfortunately, the answer is *No!* After the death of President Roosevelt, the U.S. position on Vietnam changed. In 1950, the U.S. started economically aiding the French military effort to regain Vietnam, and the rest of Indochina. By 1954, the U.S. was paying 80% of the French bill. The dissenters ask, "If the U.S. was really for the freedom of the Vietnamese people, why did we support the French colonials who had for so long exploited and suppressed the Vietnamese?" On August 4, 1953, President Eisenhower provided one answer when he said, "Now let us assume that we lost Indochina—the tin and tungsten that we so greatly value from that area would cease coming—so when the United States votes \$400 million to help that war, we are not voting a giveaway program. We are voting for the cheapest way that we can to prevent the occurrence of something that would be of a most terrible significance to the United States of America, our security, our power and ability to get certain things we need from the riches of the Indochinese territory and from Southeast Asia."

The Geneva Conference

The surrender of the French brought a military truce at the Geneva Conference in 1954. The conference called for the creation of one Vietnam, with one government which was to be elected in 1966 in an internationally supervised election. *With the promise that these elections would be held, Ho Chi Minh, whose forces controlled 3/4 of Vietnam at this point, agreed to stop fighting.* A temporary military demarcation line was created at the 17th parallel for the purpose of separating the hostile military forces, thus making it easier for the French to withdraw from Vietnam. It is important to understand that this demarcation line was in no way meant as a permanent boundary line making Vietnam into two countries, as many Americans think. In Point 6 of the Final Declaration it was stated that "the military demarcation is provisional and should not

in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary."

The French troops went south of the 17th parallel while the Vietminh forces went north. Many of the Vietminh forces were native southerners who had to leave their homes and families in the south to wait for the elections which were to take place in 1956. Some southern Vietminh, relinquishing their military status, stayed in the south to organize for the elections. This was not a violation of the Geneva Agreements.

The Geneva Accords also called for no more foreign military bases or military alliances in Vietnam—(Point 5 of the Final Declaration).

Although the U.S. did not sign the Geneva Agreements, it did in a declaration pledge to "refrain from the threat or use of force to disturb them" *The U.S. broke this pledge.*

Diem creates a separate state

After the Geneva Agreements were signed, the U.S. helped set up a new separate government in Saigon. It economically and militarily backed a man who resided and gained support in the U.S. from 1950 to 1954 while the Vietnamese were fighting for their independence from France. This man, Ngo Dinh Diem, came from a prominent, aristocratic, Catholic family in central Vietnam.

In 1954, Diem was appointed Prime Minister of the French controlled Saigon regime due to U.S. promotion and urging. In 1955, he declared himself President of the Republic of Vietnam after winning a referendum which he had set up to oust the French puppet, Bao Dai, from the presidency. *The people in the south never were given a chance to vote on whether they wanted a communist or neutralist government over an anti-communist government.* They were only given a choice between Diem or Bao Dai. This could hardly be called a free choice under such circumstances. Yet this was the kind of "freedom" the U.S. policy makers supported.

Diem consequently set up a Catholic privileged government in a land where 80% of the population was Buddhist. This was the cause for some of the opposition Diem was to run into later. An estimated 800,000 to 900,000 refugees from the north went to the south. Out of these over 80% were Catholic. According to Bernard Fall, "the mass flight was admittedly the result of an extremely intensive, well-conducted, and in terms of its objective, very successful American psychological warfare operation. Propaganda slogans and leaflets appealed to the devout Catholics with such themes as 'Christ has gone to the South' and the 'Virgin Mary has departed from the North'."

Teams of the International Control Commission came across great numbers of people who believed that the U.S. would drop atomic bombs on the north if they remained there. This fear was no doubt an added factor which motivated migration to the south.

Many of the refugees who came south were those who had been on the side of the French. Generals Thieu and Ky and most of the military junta in Saigon today are examples of those who fought on the side of the French against the Vietnamese Nationalists. Ky and many others in the junta are native northerners.

Contrary to what some Americans believe, Ho Chi Minh did not seal the borders at the 17th parallel. It was Diem who created two Vietnams by refusing ever to hold the nationwide elections for which the Geneva Agreements called. In spite of the fact that Ho Chi Minh called for these elections for six years, from 1955-1960, Diem declined, claiming that Ho would not allow fair elections. This claim had little strength since the elections were to be supervised by the International Control Commission to insure fairness on both sides. It was quite hypocritical of Diem to accuse Ho of intending to hold unfair elections when the two elections which Diem

held in the south were themselves widely regarded as frauds giving Diem the overwhelming majority of votes each time.

Probably the real reason for Diem not allowing the election to be held was his fear of Ho Chi Minh's winning. Most Vietnamese in the south knew that Ho was the leader of their fight for independence. They knew that his forces successfully drove the hated French out of Vietnam and turned the land they had gained over to the peasants.

All this time the U.S. backed the creation of a separate country in the south and gave military assistance to it. By creating military protection for the south of Vietnam under the SEATO Treaty, the U.S. broke its pledge to refrain from interference with the Geneva Agreements.

Diem's dictatorship

It soon became clear that what U.S. policy makers called "freedom" was really a dictatorial police state. Diem allowed no political opposition. He went about rounding up former Vietminh members contrary to the Geneva Agreements which called for no political reprisals. He jailed his opposition, established concentration camps "for dissenters and all those considered dangerous", and carried out countless executions for actions which Diem believed endangered his power.

He further established his dictatorship by abolishing the democratic village elections which the Vietnamese had successfully practiced for hundreds of years. In their place he appointed his own men.

Diem's police state grew more repressive as years went by until finally the Buddhists openly demonstrated en masse in the streets against this government. Some Buddhists felt such desperation that they burnt themselves to death in protest in the hopes that it would make Americans aware that Diem's government did not stand for freedom.

But all of this time, U.S. policy makers hailed Diem as the preserver of freedom. The then Vice-President, Lyndon Johnson, called him "the Churchill of Asia."

On November 1, 1963, Diem was assassinated by members of his own army. This military coup was followed by a series of other military coups ending up with the takeover of Generals Ky and Thieu.

The Ky-Thieu dictatorship

The Ky-Thieu government is the next chapter in the story of how, in the name of freedom, the U.S. supported a dictatorship. From the beginning, General Ky let it be known what he thought of allowing political opposition by declaring if his political enemies did not stop their resistance, he would "shoot their leaders." When asked who his heroes were he said, "I have only one, Hitler." He frankly admitted that "the communists were closer to the peoples' yearnings for social justice and an independent national life than his own government." (James Reston, N.Y. Times, September 1, 1965.)

Constitutional Assembly

In May 1966, the Buddhists of South Vietnam rebelled against the military dictatorship, demanding free elections to create a civilian government. The Ky government put down the rebellion with the use of U.S. tanks and guns, killing hundreds and jailing thousands. But as pressure mounted for these elections to be held, Ky's government finally consented to allow them. The authorization of an assembly to create a constitution was given. Unfortunately by disqualifying any candidate who openly supported peace or neutrality, the term "free elections" became a farce. In a land where 80% of the people are peasants, most of the members elected to the constitutional assembly were wealthy landowners. When the subject of land reform, one of the south's most pressing problems, was brought up for discussion, only 3 of the 117 member assembly approved it for discussion; the rest

of the assembly refused even to consider the topic!

The constitution that was created was hailed as a great document of freedom by U.S. policy makers but the dissenters disagree with this viewpoint. They contend that since the constitution prohibits any kind of communist activity there is no real freedom allowed. *We say we are for self-determination and freedom, but we support governments who are afraid to politically compete with the communists.*

The dissenters contend that there can be no guarantee of free speech and press if these freedoms can be restricted whenever they harm "personal honor, national security or good morals."

In effect, the constitution kept those who had power, in power, and did not allow real dissent which is the partner of freedom.

Village elections

In the spring of 1967, village elections in "government controlled areas" (less than 1/2 the total estimated villages in the south) were held for the first time since Diem had abolished them. Although these were also hailed as free elections, they too were set up so that no true opposition could be voiced. Mike Wallace of CBS News reported on nationwide television that the Saigon government appointed their own men as Province Chiefs. These Chiefs in turn were given the power to decide who could or could not be candidates for the village elections. All voters had their I.D. cards marked to show if they had participated in the elections. Villagers had to participate in these elections if they wanted to be citizens in good standing with the village council who could grant or withhold favors. The dissenters wonder if we in the U.S. would call our town elections "free" if President Johnson's appointed men could tell us who could and could not be candidates in our local elections.

National elections

After establishing their power by allowing no true opposition in the constitutional assembly and in the provinces, the military regime allowed the campaign for national elections to get under way with Ky and Thieu running on the military ticket in spite of previous denials that they would ever run. The dissenters believe that there were several factors which made these elections a farce if not a fraud as has been charged.

First, the military regime eliminated their serious opponents by not allowing them to run for office. One man who wanted to run on a peace platform was disqualified with the charge he was pro-communist although there was no evidence to support such a charge, according to U.S. officials. Ky told newsmen he wanted no communist or neutralist to head South Vietnam's new civilian government and that if such a man won the Presidency he was "going to fight him militarily." The dissenters ask, "Is this what we in the U.S. can call freedom?"

Second, press censorship was practiced by the military regime. Newspapers had to be subjected to the government's censorship board before they could go to press. Ky threatened to close Vietnamese newspapers that created "dissension" during the election. Shortly before the election, despite the fact that official censorship was to be abolished, three daily papers were shut down.

Third, the military junta placed themselves in the number nine position of the balloting. Although most Americans would think that the number one position would be most advantageous, this is not necessarily so in Vietnam, because number nine happens to be the Buddhist magic number. In an area whose population is 80% Buddhist, and in an election in which many voters were unfamiliar with the candidates, but had to choose 6 ballots out of 59 quickly, the number 9 ballot was most advantageous.

Fourth, the civilian candidates did not have at their disposal the unlimited use of government transportation and facilities for campaign purposes that the military candidates had. The military could fly where they wanted, when they wanted, and could distribute such things as government food-stuffs as gifts when campaigning for votes.

Fifth, according to the election laws, Generals Thieu and Ky were supposed to resign their government positions if they wanted to run as candidates for the new government. This they refused to do. They also were not to start campaigning before a set date; this specification they also ignored.

Sixth, it was admitted that some soldiers had been given two voting cards.

Seventh, not all Vietnamese in the south participated in the elections. Only some 5 million people were allowed to register. Those considered communists, neutralists, or those living in "insecure areas" could not vote. Out of those registered, only 83% actually voted. In spite of the overwhelming advantages that the military regime had, it received the endorsement of only 35% of those who voted. Therefore it is dishonest to say that the results of these elections represented the majority of the people in the south.

Interestingly, the runner-up was a little known figure who used the peace dove as his symbol; he was later jailed by the military regime when the elections, charged with irregularities, were being contested.

The combined vote won by the three runners' up totaled more than the vote won by the military ticket. Since these three candidates all called for peace, the dissenters believe that the continued policy of war by the Thieu-Ky government is unrepresentative of the Vietnamese people.

So the free elections for which the Buddhists had demonstrated in 1966 in order to create a representative civilian government were turned into a sham. The military government is still in control and thousands of political prisoners are still in jail. It is this type of "freedom" that America is supporting at a cost of \$85 million a day and thousands of lives. The dissenters ask, "Is this the kind of freedom with which America should associate itself?"

ARE WE INVOLVED IN VIETNAM BECAUSE OF A "SOLEMN COMMITMENT?"

SEATO—A violation of the Geneva agreements

U.S. policy makers imply that we are involved in Vietnam to fulfill our commitments under the SEATO Treaty. But the fact is the U.S. intervention in Vietnam cannot be sanctioned as a SEATO operation because we do not have the unanimous consent of all eight of the Treaty nations or the consent of the UN Security Council. Both are requirements before armed intervention can take place under SEATO.

We have only token troop support by some SEATO members while the South Koreans, who have given the most men (numbering about 50,000) are being paid by the U.S. to fight. Britain, France, and Pakistan (who are also SEATO members) will not aid us in our actions—Vietnam is not a member of SEATO.

Geneva agreements pledge broken

The U.S. also violated its pledge not to interfere with the Geneva Agreements. It supported a man who refused to reunify the country through internationally supervised elections as called for by the Geneva Agreements. It supported a man who carried on military reprisals as forbidden by the Geneva Agreements. It intervened militarily as forbidden in the Geneva Agreements. The fact that the SEATO Treaty was set up to cover South Vietnam is in itself a violation of the Geneva Agreements since the Agreements forbid any military alliances.

After breaking its pledge in many ways, the U.S. now claims it wants to go back to

the Geneva Agreements as a basis for settlement. The dissenters want to know what the policy makers mean by this. Why would they be willing to observe the Agreements today if they were not willing to do so in 1954? Are the policy makers now willing to allow an internationally supervised election to choose one government for all Vietnam as called for in the Agreements? Are they willing to withdraw all forbidden foreign troops as called for by the Agreements? What precisely do the policy makers mean?

U.N. Charter commitment broken

The dissenters say the U.S. not only violated its pledge to the Geneva Agreements but also broke its most solemn commitment of all—the U.S. commitment to observe the United Nations Charter. The U.S. has violated Article 53 of the UN Charter. Under this article, "no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council, with the exception of measures against any enemy state. . . ." "The term enemy state . . . applies to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of the present Charter." It is quite clear that Vietnam was not an enemy state to the U.S. during World War II.

The United States ratified the UN charter which, according to the U.S. Constitution, makes the UN Charter "supreme law of the land." It is thus evident that U.S. involvement in Vietnam is also a violation of our own law.

Our "commitment" in South Vietnam started out with a letter by President Eisenhower offering economic aid to Diem on the condition that certain reforms were carried out. Today that involvement has grown to a cost of some \$85,000,000 a day and still no relevant reforms have been made.

What constitutes a commitment?

The dissenters ask, what makes a *solemn commitment*? Can different, limited commitments by various presidents make up unlimited binding commitments? If so, may not the fact that there are U.S. special forces troops now in 17 Latin American countries commit the U.S. to involvements of unlimited escalation? (Parade Magazine, 9-24-67, "Will We Have Another Vietnam in Latin America?") These forces are involved in the same type of activities as were U.S. special forces in Vietnam 10 years ago. Today U.S. military involvement in Thailand has grown to number over 50,000 forces. What the dissenters ask is "how many 'Vietnams' will evolve out of these 'limited' commitments?" Should not matters of such great importance be discussed and decided by the Senate which is the rightful constitutional body for such things? Should not matters of such great importance also be discussed openly by the American people before someone claims the U.S. has a solemn commitment?

IS THE UNITED STATES STOPPING AGGRESSION?

The U.S. policy makers tell the American public that the conflict in Vietnam is the result of aggression. They try to make an analogy with Hitler's aggression and say that to appease such aggression will only invite a larger war. This view about appeasement resulting in larger wars although valid in the case of Hitler, cannot apply to Vietnam because the conflict in Vietnam is not the result of aggression, say the dissenters. They challenge that contention saying the fighting is instead the combined result of a civil war, a social revolution, and a war of independence against foreign domination and interference.

The dissenters would agree with Eric Sevareid who said, "When men speaking the same language, living within the same cultural context, raised in the same cities and villages fight one another by the thousands, that is civil war. When men of the North (in-

cluding Prime Minister Ky) are part of the government of the South and vice versa, it is a civil war. Even the Geneva Agreements called the two, 'zones' of the one country, not sovereign states." There has been no invasion from an external power such as the German invasion of Poland during World War II.

More important is the fact that the Vietnamese themselves, both north and south, recognize Vietnam as only one country. The newly formed constitution of the south states in Article I (#1), "Vietnam is a territorially indivisible, unified and independent republic." Article 107 states, "Article I of the constitution and this Article may not be amended or deleted."

The dissenters claim the facts show that the conflict in the south started as an indigenous revolt against a repressive, undemocratic leader and that it was later supported by the north, after the U.S. had intervened militarily.

Diem's actions create revolt

The dissenters say a revolt was created in the south due to Diem's brutal suppression of political opposition and his treatment of the peasants. Diem took away their traditional village elections and he carried out a land reform program which, in reality, benefited the landowners instead of the peasants. He reclaimed land which the Vietminh had turned over to the peasants and which the peasants believed to be theirs. Often unreasonable back rents and taxes were charged which the peasants were not able to pay. These factors alienated the peasants from Diem's government.

Who are the Vietcong?

The notion of the Vietcong being "outside aggressors" is perpetuated by the mass media in the U.S. when they refer to the side the U.S. is fighting as "the Vietcong" while referring to the side it supports as "the South Vietnamese." The National Liberation Front and their "Vietcong" forces are as much "South Vietnamese" as the Saigon regime and the ARVN forces!

In 1964, David Halberstam, a *New York Times* correspondent who won the Pulitzer Prize for his reporting in Vietnam, wrote: "The war is largely a conflict of Southerners fought on Southern land. No capture of North Vietnamese in the South has come to light, and it is generally believed that most Vietcong weapons have been seized from the South Vietnamese forces."

As oppression from Diem's dictatorship grew, the rebellion against it grew. This increasing resistance resulted in the formation of the National Liberation Front in 1960. This group is sometimes called the Vietcong, meaning the Vietnamese Communists. This is a bad nickname, because the Front is made up of many elements in South Vietnam; not only communists, but also non-communists, Buddhists, Catholics, liberals, businessmen, peasants, and minority groups. The one goal they have in common is the freedom of their people from the repressive U.S. supported Saigon government. They say they would accept a *neutralist* government as long as they were given a voice in that government—something which the U.S. has never allowed. They say they would accept a neutralist foreign policy. They favor eventual but not immediate re-unification with the north, their first goal being stabilization of the south, not re-unification.

As American presence escalated, Hanoi increased its aid

Because the terms of the Geneva Agreements were never honored concerning the promised elections, the Hanoi government had every legal right to militarily retake the southern land it had controlled and voluntarily given up on 1954. This they did not do! Up to 1960, the Hanoi government discouraged the armed resistance of southerners to

Diem, still hoping that Diem would eventually allow the promised elections. After having the call for re-unification elections turned down for the sixth straight year, Hanoi finally endorsed armed resistance after the N.L.F. was formed.

In 1963, shortly before his assassination, President Kennedy was re-evaluating the wisdom of U.S. intervention in the conflict. He ordered 1,000 U.S. troops to be withdrawn, but this order was never carried out because two days after Kennedy's death the order was quietly cancelled and instead U.S. troop strength was increased. Although 1964 saw Johnson campaigning for the presidency with the slogan, "We are not going to send American boys 9,000 or 10,000 miles away to do what Asian boys ought to be doing for themselves," 1965 saw President Johnson escalating the war by increasing U.S. troop buildup from 23,300 by end of 1964 to 128,500 by September 1965. At this time the situation in South Vietnam was so bad that in order to keep the Saigon government in existence the war became an American war with American boys doing the job Asian boys would not do.

Even if North Vietnam was a separate country, the U.S. charge of aggression would have little foundation, because when the U.S. started bombing the north in 1965, Pentagon figures showed the presence of only 400 confirmed North Vietnamese in the south while the U.S. had over 23,300 troops in Vietnam. Those "thousands" whom U.S. policy makers claim "infiltrated" from the north, were native southerners of the Vietminh who went back to their homes and families after many years of separation. The Geneva Agreements had required them to go north only until 1956 when the French were to have withdrawn and the promised elections were to have been held. Therefore, nothing legally compelled them to stay away from their homes indefinitely! Back in the south these former Vietminh joined the armed resistance which was already under way due to Diem's police state.

U.S. policy makers say the N.L.F. is controlled by the Hanoi government and that Hanoi is the cause of the fighting. If the north were to withdraw all its troops, there would still be a far greater number of native southerners who would continue to fight. Until the U.S. recognizes the National Liberation Front and is willing to deal directly with it, the fighting will continue in the south, no matter if Hanoi negotiates or not. Even if the U.S. wipes North Vietnam off the face of the map, the fighting will continue in the south because that is where it began and the causes that created the fighting still exist today.

Today, Americans are told that in the end the battle is for the hearts and minds of the people. The dissenters ask, if this conflict is really the result of aggression on the people, why do we have to "win their hearts and minds?" The U.S. did not have to win the French when it liberated them from the Germans in World War II.

UN Secretary General U Thant has said, "It is nationalism, and not communism that animates the resistance movement in Vietnam against all foreigners, and now particularly against Americans."

The Americans are the foreigners in Vietnam; the National Liberation Front and the north Vietnamese are not. The Vietnamese people must be allowed to settle their own problems without outside interference.

Chinese aggression?

One also hears the idea that the U.S. must fight in Vietnam because it has to contain "Chinese aggression." The dissenters find this concept quite bewildering! While the U.S. has nearly a half million troops in Vietnam, the Chinese have no fighting troops in Vietnam. While the U.S. is bombing within miles of the Chinese border and sometimes over into

it, the Chinese are not bombing anywhere, let alone near U.S. borders. While the U.S. has military bases encircling China, China has no military bases off her soil, let alone surrounding the U.S.!

The dissenters ask, Where is there evidence of Chinese aggression? They say:

Certainly the aid it has given north Vietnam in the form of military equipment and advisors cannot be called "aggression". (The U.S. is providing military equipment and "advisors" to many countries in the world today.)

Certainly the conflicts with India over disputed border territory cannot be called aggression. (The U.S. engaged in many conflicts over disputed territory in its past.)

Certainly putting down the rebellion in Tibet which has been *traditionally recognized by the U.S.* as a region of China cannot be called aggression. (The U.S. government sent its troops to Mississippi to enforce federal laws.)

Certainly one cannot label as aggression China's sending troops into North Korea only after MacArthur's forces had invaded the north and were very close to the Chinese border. (If Chinese troops were marching towards the U.S. border in Mexico would not the U.S. claim the right to defend itself?) Certainly this action by China cannot illustrate "aggressive" territorial ambitions since China withdrew her troops from Korea while the U.S. still maintains 50,000 troops in South Korea today.

Certainly, the claim of mainland China to Taiwan cannot be called "aggression" any more than Tiwan's claim to mainland China can be called Aggression. Taiwan has been recognized as a part of China by the U.S., so the question here is not aggression but which government is the rightful government of China.

Certainly, the statements of Mao and Lin Biao cannot be labeled "aggressive" for if one closely examines these statements urging revolution, they would find reference to *autonomous, self-reliant revolutions within countries*, nor liberation by the Chinese. Nowhere in these statements can one find evidence of Chinese intentions to expand, invade, or conquer.

SOLUTION?

U.S. military policy believed self-defeating

The dissenters agree with many veteran news reporters and U.S. volunteers in Vietnam who believe more people are joining the N.L.F. due to U.S. military operations and policy in the south. They believe that by supporting a corrupt, unpopular regime which has done little to help the plight of the people, by dropping millions of tons of bombs, napalm, and toxic chemicals, by destroying hundreds of thousands of acres of land by defoliation and razing operations, by uprooting whole villages from their ancestral homes, by creating millions of refugees (thousands being burned and maimed), *the U.S. is carrying on a self-defeating policy.* You cannot "win the hearts and minds of people" this way!

The people of the north have rallied to the side of the Hanoi government since U.S. bombing started; observers visiting there say Hanoi, having the support of the people, has armed the peasants—something an unpopular government such as that in Saigon, could never do!

Traditionally, Vietnamese have felt animosity toward the Chinese due to historical background; U.S. bombing of the north has made a reluctant Hanoi more dependent on China for support than it ever was.

If the U.S. fears an international communist conspiracy, why is it carrying out a policy which only brings the communist world closer together?

Military victory?

Some Americans are calling for a military victory in Vietnam. The dissenters ask, What

will a military solution mean? Will the U.S. have to destroy the very people it says it is protecting to gain such a victory? Will the U.S. have to resort to nuclear weapons in pursuit of a military solution? Will the U.S. have to indefinitely occupy Vietnam militarily to keep the Saigon government in power?

A Washington Post editorial of October 17, 1967 stated, "civilian casualties are running upwards of 100,000 a year . . . Some 50,000 new refugees a month are being generated and the estimate of the refugee total is 4 million—a full quarter of the country's population." Official sources estimate 2 million refugees. Whatever the number, it is a deplorable situation. Roger Hillsman, former Under Secretary of State under Kennedy, said, "We must honestly face the fact that it was not Vietcong terrorism that drove the refugees from their ancestral homes to the cities and towns . . . It was American and Vietnamese bombing and shelling."

The dissenters say there is no solution in a military "victory"—only more hatred for Americans by the Vietnamese people, who are in ever greater numbers losing their homes and families because of American military operations.

Withdrawal?

For those who say that the U.S. cannot withdraw because the result would be a blood bath of reprisals against those whom we have been supporting, the dissenters ask, "What is occurring now if it isn't an ever-growing blood bath?"

The dissenters feel that the U.S. would not lose face by admitting that intervention in Vietnam has been a mistake, but would gain the respect of world opinion which is so heavily against it now.

They maintain that a *carefully planned phased military withdrawal* by the U.S. would be in the interest of all concerned. Some type of international supervision could replace U.S. military forces to guard against reprisals. Provisions could be made for those who wish to reside in the U.S. The dissenters claim this would result in *far less* death and destruction, for U.S. actions are creating more problems for Vietnam than they are solving.

What the United States has not done to end the conflict

U.S. policy makers have said that the Hanoi government has never shown interest in talking peace but the facts are that Hanoi has been willing to meet with U.S. representatives in the past. In 1964, Secretary General U Thant set up a meeting in Rangoon, Burma, to which the Hanoi government was willing to send representatives but the U.S. was not.

Another meeting was planned for December 1966 in Warsaw, Poland, to which Hanoi had agreed to send representatives; but just days before the meeting was to take place, the U.S. escalated the war, bombing residential areas of Hanoi for the first time. Hanoi, accusing the U.S. of bad faith, cancelled the meeting. The dissenters ask, "Why did the U.S. escalate their military actions when there was a chance of settling the conflict through negotiations?"

Three scholars, Schurmann, Scott, and Zelnick have written a book called the "Politics of Escalation in Vietnam" which cites *nine critical periods* in the course of the war in which *opportunities* were broken off by U.S. actions, mostly in the form of military escalation.

The U.S. has not been willing unconditionally to stop bombing the north to see if peace talks would begin as the Hanoi government has indicated they could. Instead of taking this chance, the U.S. is pursuing a course that stands *far less chance* of stopping the bloodshed.

Most important of all, the U.S. has not been willing to recognize and deal directly with the force it is mainly fighting—the N.L.F.

By pursuing its present course of military escalation, the U.S. is in for a long, increasingly costlier war—(1) where trying to solve a political problem by a military means will bring no real solution, (2) where there is a possibility of an endless land war in Asia developing, and (3) where there is a possibility of creating a nuclear holocaust!

The dissenters are shocked and dismayed at the moral decay inherent in our military presence in Vietnam, a decay which is alarmingly evident on all sides. Our own boys are being killed in great numbers for a cause many cannot understand. Thousands and thousands of innocent people have been killed and maimed by our military actions in Vietnam. Surely we need not prove that we are the wealthiest and greatest military power in history. We need to prove our faith in mankind and our own moral fiber by positive economic leadership and the will to settle differences *without killing*. No other course can possibly be contemplated in this evolutionary nuclear age.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

SENATORIAL STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate, Senate Resolution 266, which will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. Calendar No. 996, Senate Resolution 266, a resolution to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under a previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Senate Resolution 266.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, my remarks at this time will be in the nature of an explanation of the provisions of Senate Resolution 266.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] be listed as coauthors of Senate Resolution 266.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, at the outset I make the point that I made to some extent on Friday, when the substance of the resolution was released, that we were not undertaking to write a police code or any other kind of a code.

Rather, the resolution proposes certain standards of conduct and regulations regarding the conduct of Senators and their staffs and the staff of the Senate, and particularly those members of the staff who are in more strategic positions.

Senators, as well as the staff members who are selected by the Senators, are thought to be at least responsible people by their constituents or they would not be here. I think a Senator's selection of a staff carries the stamp of approval and the opinion of the Senator himself as to the qualifications of the staff.

It is no reflection on anyone to propose that we adopt these standards and regulations. It is an attempt to regulate and set out in writing some of the regulations and standards that we thought should apply to the handling of the business of the Senate and even the business of a Senator's office.

We tried with the greatest emphasis to cover the responsibility of Senators with respect to staff matters. We tried to avoid disturbing that relationship of mutual respect and responsibility that does exist between a Senator and the members of his staff.

No one realizes more than does a member of our select committee how much a Senator is dependent upon his staff and the large volume of work that must be done. I yield to no other Senator in my appreciation for my personal staff and its members. I not only have great confidence in them, but I also look upon them and feel about them as I do about personal friends. I also feel that way about the Senate staff that I have had the privilege to know.

I emphasize that fact in the beginning of my remarks so that anything that is said hereafter will be certain to be fully understood.

Mr. President, the Senate is now almost 200 years old, and it has not heretofore had any existing written standards of conduct. It has, nevertheless, been able to police itself rather well in a way and has been able to meet the problems as they arose under standards that were found to be generally acceptable at the time.

We do not pretend to displace those backgrounds of precedents concerning standards and trust and the fiduciary relationship of the Senate with the people and a Senator's obligations.

We do not try to write a full code of regulations. However, we do set forth in the very beginning that our effort is merely to add rules and not to replace that great body of unwritten but generally accepted standards that will, of course, continue in effect.

We propose to complement those standards and, so far as these rules go, a great many of them relate to problems that have arisen by reason of the tremendously increased cost of holding office, the cost that goes with attending to the regular duties, the semiofficial duties, the semipublic duties, and also the tremendous cost involved in campaigns for reelection.

I have some figures, to which I will refer later, which underscore with emphasis that amount.

In a sort of preamble to these rules,

we point out with pride that public office is a public trust. Not many months ago, I delivered a speech to a group of fine young people, in which I brought out that point. One fine young man afterward said, "What do you mean, 'public trust'?" He impressed me with the fact that he had never heard this explained or gone into or emphasized—not sufficiently, anyway. I believe that one of the reasons why we have unsettled conditions in these times is that we have not emphasized this fact sufficiently.

So by this language we reaffirm the idea that has come down throughout the history of our great Nation, that public office is still a public trust. It is a rule, a guide to conduct as an officer; and it has been the rule and guide in our writing these proposed additional rules of the Senate. I believe if we consider them in the light of our background, we will understand them better and will be able to live up to them easier.

I wish to point out that nothing contained in this code proposes a penalty or a sanction or a sentence for violation. The reason for that is simple. The rule carries with it the situation under which it would be enforced if there is a violation of these rules. Put in simple language, it would be a possible ground for consideration of the censure or other reprimand of a Senator, or even for his expulsion. I judge that in the case of minor violations, it will be well understood that all that would be necessary to correct the situation would be to call it to the attention of the Senator.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that by the very nature of things a willful violation of the rule would naturally be considered, but if it came to the floor of the Senate, as being a matter that could be considered by this body, whether or not it was controlling, would depend upon the facts in the proposed reprimand, censure, or even expulsion of a Senator.

As to a staff member, it would certainly make him ineligible to receive further compensation out of the funds of the Senate. A very ordinary resolution to that effect would control.

I would think that most of these violations that would come along would be minor, and more or less an omission rather than a commission, and that when called on there would be an immediate and full faith correction by the Senator or staff member involved. Certainly a willful violation would be evidence in any proceeding involving the conduct of a Senator.

In going into these different proposed rules, the committee approached the matter in this way. What is the problem in this field? What is the problem connected with this subject matter?

I was trying to state the problem generally and then give the considerations that were weighed by the committee, the conclusions of the committee with respect to an adequate remedy, and something about how the rule would operate. As a part of the legislative history, I shall have some prepared remarks to make later, but I wish now to discuss these matters from the standpoint I have already outlined.

With respect to, "What was the prob-

lem"? the first rule applies to outside business. This is found on page 2 of the resolution, proposed rule *XLI*, and is covered on page 6 of the report.

With respect to outside business, the financial or professional activity or employment by officers or employees, the problem there is, What kind of outside business, if any, financial or professional activity is going to be allowed officers or employees of the Senate, and, What will be the regulations that will pertain thereto.

One of the simplest things to be done would be to provide that they should not have any outside employment of any kind or any outside activities of any kind. This would be a very harsh rule, indeed. It would preclude one from continuing any activity he had when he accepted the employment and some of these employments are temporary, based on control of the Senate. Certainly, the tenure of a Senator himself is uncertain. The Senator could not get the caliber of men he needs to take top positions on his staff. They could not continue the livelihood of some men, and in certain businesses the activities do not conflict with duties.

We found that many Senators had part-time employees and employees back in their States. These are people who go into trouble spots with respect to problems that arise in regard to constituents.

That was another reason why we could not impose simply total prohibition, but at the same time the evidence was overwhelming that these things lead to trouble, embarrassment, and reflection on the Senate. There had been an outstanding case here in the Senate within the last few years.

After they have gone so far and so long, their actions reflect on all of us. It all reflects on every Member of this body and upon the institution as a whole.

By the way, we found that the Senate now has more than 3,000 employees—that is, the Senate directly and the members of the Senators' staffs. The number was but a few hundred not many years ago. So the complexity of our activity demonstrates the need for some kind of regulation. The regulation that is proposed will apply, though, only to about 600 employees, so far as the making of reports is concerned.

Finally, we seek to leave to Senators the determination of the obligations of their staff members, so as not to disturb the close relationship and affinity that should exist between a staff member and the Senator by whom he is employed. Further, we have tried to leave the clear responsibility upon the Senator himself.

So we have written a very simple rule and have then provided for its enforcement:

1. No officer or employee whose salary is paid by the Senate—

As I have said, that applies to an employee of the Senate or to a Senator—may engage in any business, financial, or professional activity or employment for compensation or gain unless—

(a) the activity or employment is not inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his official duties; and

(b) he has reported in writing the activ-

ity or employment to and has received permission from the Member of the Senate or officer of the Senate charged with supervision of the officer or employee by this rule.

In other words, the responsibility is placed on the employee to disclose fully to his employer what business, financial, professional activity, or employment for compensation he has at that time, and also the responsibility to disclose any after-acquired business, financial, professional activity, or employment for compensation or gain that he may have. It is his duty to disclose all of that in writing to the Senator, or to the official of this body who is responsible for employing those who work for the Senate itself. The employee has to make a judgment and then set it down in writing, all of these activities and whether, in his judgment, they are consistent with the conscientious performance of his duties. Then, after that is done, the Senator himself must make a judgment. There is no particular penalty involved. It is not spelled out. But the Senator must make a judgment from the facts presented to him whether the activities are consistent with the discharge of that duty. That brings everything out in the open, making a judgment on both men which they will have to live with later.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Do I correctly understand that an employee is expected to report all outside activities that bring him in any income, whether they can be regarded as being inconsistent with his duties or not; and having reported them to his employer, the employer and he would have occasion to look at the report to see whether there was any conflict of interest or any impropriety of a person being engaged in a particular business?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct in stating it. The spirit of the rule is that all activities of a prospective staff member will be disclosed to a Senator in writing, as to what those activities are, the businesses engaged in, whether the staff member has any professional activities, such as practicing law, or being a writer. Then the Senator would necessarily have to make a judgment on that and if there was any disagreement between the Senator and the staff member, the staff member would have to drop those activities or he would not be employed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As I understand it, in some cases there may be situations where the person had a small business prior to coming into the Government and he has made arrangements with others to take care of the details of that business. In the event that this person is hired as a full-time employee and he still has that full-time business, what would the committee's recommendation be in that kind of situation?

Mr. STENNIS. That is a difficult matter fully to clarify. We did not spell it out any further than we did. The Senator himself will have to make that judgment as to whether activities or prior employment would render a man's work for the Senate inconsistent with the performance of his duties. The Senator has to act on that, because the report is before him in writing, the man is applying

as a prospective employee, and if he does not fully disclose his activities in the report and it comes up later and the Senator has reason to have acted on what he had in the report before him, that would be a matter of judgment. It is just a regulation to that extent. It does not try to put the idea of employing a staff member such as we would a laborer in the labor market. It cannot be done that way.

We had the idea of putting in this regulation to that extent. We had to designate those who would be responsible, and a Senator is responsible for his own staff members, of course. If a Senator is chairman of a committee, he is responsible for his committee staff members. We put that in here. Some of the committees, of course, are very large. We provide that if a subcommittee is operating on funds expressly authorized by the Senate, then the subcommittee chairman would be responsible for his staff members. We are not particularly wedded to that point, but we thought it was fair to chairmen of such subcommittees. Therefore, the regulation tries to bring out the facts to start with, and tries to get a judgment out of Senators.

It is an insurance to the Senate. Let me illustrate: the minority leader or the majority leader may wish to bring a man into the very bosom of the Senate. They would be responsible for making a judgment beforehand about such a man's outside activities.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Do I correctly understand that the rule goes to the disclosure, that the rule does not seek to limit in any respect the extent of the outside activities of an employee? But, as I understand it—correctly, I hope—it is where something of an unwritten rule comes into effect, that a Senator should perhaps consider whether an employee can properly discharge the functions of his office, or the responsibility he owes to a committee, if his activities are such that they require a great deal of his time over and beyond the time available to work for the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct; yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Thus far, let me say, I have never inquired of staff members on the committee, on one of which I happen to be chairman, for example, just what they do with their time after they have done a day's work for the Senate, as long as they do a full day's work in the Senate. The rule, as I understand it, would impose a responsibility on the committee chairman to do something about what the people are doing to advance their private accounts when they are not working on Senate time—that is, after the office closes for the day.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; that is correct.

It is not a matter of merely policing everyone all the time, but there is imposed on a Senator as chairman of a committee—the Senator from Louisiana as chairman of the Finance Committee, for example—a general obligation to have the reports brought to his attention and to make judgments on them. That would have to be supplemented whenever new activities occurred, and the Senator would have to pass on them.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That would

impose two responsibilities on the committee chairman: One, to decide whether there was any conflict of interest and, two, to pass judgment on whether a person with that much outside activity could be devoting a proper amount of time and attention to the assigned work of the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator would have to make a judgment on that. There is no way that I know of where the Senator would be held to a microscopic responsibility in this, but he would have a general obligation to the Senate. I think that would change the atmosphere as to some of the cases we have had happen.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that the rule being proposed—and I intend to vote for it—will, for the future, impose on both Senators and on committee chairmen what has not been regarded as their responsibility to this point; that is, it would seem to put the burden on Senators to pass judgment on whether or not an employee whose principal activities involved outside work, who has not a great deal of work to do for the committee or for the staff, but who is devoting most of his time to his private business, should serve on that basis.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. There are so many employees now, more than 3,000 of them, and so much is going on, that they can get into or be in, that it was thought there had to be some responsibility assigned to whoever signs the vouchers.

We on the part of the committee do not want to convert this into a snooping expedition, acting that way all the time, or destroy the relationship between the Senator and his staff; so the committee devised this rule, which would put the responsibility on the staff member to bring in the facts and the Senator would make the judgment on it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I think the committee has served the Senate well in this regard. It is quite possible that some of the employee's outside activities might tend to affect his recommendations or his suggestions to the chairman or a Senator. If there is some outside business that might color his judgment, it would be well that we know about it. I think it is a worthwhile rule.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, and the Senator would make his judgment on it, and the Senate could look to the Senator when the matter came up, not to try to punish, but to state that here is the set of facts and here is its responsibilities under the rule.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I want to yield to every Senator who wants me to yield. I do not know whether I should let the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] proceed, or yield at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. Alphabetically, is all right.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Vermont is always in order. I yield to him.

Mr. AIKEN. I want to commend the committee for doing the best it could with an almost impossible assignment.

Is there any limit as to what an employee of the Senate might earn, in addition to the remuneration of the Senate, with the consent of his adviser?

Mr. STENNIS. No; we did not put a

ceiling on it. That is up to the judgment of the Senator, as I say.

Mr. AIKEN. However, if he, the employee, is compensated at the rate of \$15,000 a year or more, he is required to make a confidential report to the Comptroller General of his earnings or income?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. If he were compensated at the rate of \$14,000 and earned \$35,000 a year outside working hours in the Senate, he would not have to report that. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. He would not have to make a report; that is true. We used that amount as the cutoff spot. But the Senator would still have to make a judgment on these matters and have to assume that responsibility when the staff member was initially employed.

Mr. AIKEN. I will go along with that, but I will say that Senators have a considerable responsibility with what they have at the present time without supervising the personal affairs of their employees.

Speaking of Senators, I notice that a Senator may not receive a gift in the aggregate amount of \$50 or more from any single source except a gift from his spouse, child, or parent. Is there anything to prohibit a Senator's spouse from receiving a gift of, let us say, a refrigerator or a television set or something that might cost in the neighborhood of \$500? Is he responsible for all the activities of his spouse?

Mr. STENNIS. No; we did not go into the field of the spouse at all. It is involved incidentally with reference to the proposal regarding the income tax return, if it be a joint return. We did not feel that we had any direct jurisdiction over the spouse. Now, that can come up as a matter of fact and proof with reference to a case.

Mr. AIKEN. Who does have jurisdiction over a spouse?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not know of anyone, unless the Senator from Vermont might have a special rule of his own. We did not try to reach that far.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand why.

One other question, and then I am through. A Senator is required to report the amount of his professional fees—I suppose this applies to lawyers—the amount or value and source of each fee or compensation of \$1,000 or more received by him during the preceding year from a client for legal service.

The \$1,000 figure intrigues me. Would he have to report several \$995 legal fees?

Mr. STENNIS. No; not under the provisions of this rule. That is the cutoff level in making the report. If he belongs to a law firm, there are a great many fees that would be involved, in the amount of \$50, \$100, \$200, and on up. We decided that we were really discriminating there when we selected lawyers to make the report, but we passed a cutoff.

Mr. AIKEN. If a member of a large, reputable, well-known law firm charged a fee of less than \$1,000, that would be unusual, anyway.

Mr. STENNIS. Down where I live, no, it would not be unusual, if it were less than \$1,000.

Mr. AIKEN. As I said in the beginning, I am sure the committee did the best it could with an almost impossible assignment.

Mr. STENNIS. Most fees would run more than \$1,000 for handling major matters, where a Senator would be involved in them.

Mr. AIKEN. Most Senators will be conscientious in following the rules. Once in awhile, perhaps, there would be one who would not be as conscientious as the majority. But I think the committee has done the best it could with its assignment, and it could possibly do some good.

Mr. STENNIS. Well, we hope so, and appreciate the attitude of the Senator, too, and his estimation of the situation.

Mr. AIKEN. We just cannot make everybody honest by law.

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly agree with the Senator. We are not dealing with a group of criminals, anyway, when we are dealing with 100 Senators.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree.

Mr. STENNIS. We are just trying to have some rules.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I was interested in the colloquy concerning a \$50 gift. Suppose the chamber of commerce or a farmers' organization invited me to make a speech in North Dakota and sent me a round-trip airplane ticket. Is that an expense, an honorarium, or a gift?

Mr. STENNIS. No; I do not think it is an honorarium, and it is not a gift. It is purely reimbursement for out-of-pocket money that the Senator would pay for the plane ticket. We do not intend to regulate that at all. That is just to put a man in the place he was in before he left here to make the trip.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure Senators are aware of the fact that quite a few Senators are members of law firms.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose a Senator receives from his law firm \$2,500 or \$5,000 a year for services. Would he have to show how he worked for that?

Mr. STENNIS. No.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that whatever he receives, whether he works or not, he will not have to do anything except account for receiving the money?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Whether he worked for it or whether he simply permitted the use of his name in order to get this money makes no difference?

Mr. STENNIS. Let me answer that in this way: So far as our requirement that he must report it is concerned, he does not have to state how much work was involved, or explain what he did or how much he did. We only require him, under this provision, to report it.

It could later become a question of fact, and relevant to some inquiry, where the question of how much he did would have a bearing upon the true situation.

But we are merely saying, "You must run up a flag here by reporting this." Then the information will be lying there, and if anything does come up, at least

there will be a starting point from which to begin collecting the facts.

It places Senators on notice that there is a requirement of that kind for major representation. I would not think of trying to outlaw the practice of law just because a man is in the Senate; but we did think there should be some regulation of it, and this is the extent of the proposed regulation.

Mr. ELLENDER. As to filing the list of the assets that a Senator has, suppose a Senator came into the Senate, let us say, as I did, 31 years ago, having bought property for \$10,000, and that property is now worth \$500,000. How would he have to report that? The amount he paid is only \$10,000.

Mr. STENNIS. That is right.

Mr. ELLENDER. And it has grown in value, over 30 years, to where today it is worth \$500,000. How would that have to be reported?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator lists whether or not it is \$10,000 or more. Items worth \$10,000 and more are the only ones that have to be reported under this requirement. If it is a certain piece of real estate, say Black Acre, as they used to refer to examples in the law books, as Black Acre increases in value, at the point where it becomes, in his judgment, worth more than \$10,000, the Senator would have to report it.

Thereafter, the Senator would not have to report any more—just at \$10,000 or above, under this rule.

Mr. ELLENDER. Am I to understand, then, that when a report is made by a Senator, no matter what the property cost him, he must more or less state the market value at the time he makes his report? Is that not what it amounts to?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to read the provision carefully. It just requires the reporting of the identity of items of real estate or personal property having a value of \$10,000 or more—Senators do not have to state what it is worth—which they owned at any time during the preceding year.

So as to the piece of land in question, in the year following the year that it reached, in the opinion and judgment of the Senator, a value of \$10,000, he should report it. But all the Senator has to do is report it as being worth \$10,000 or more.

There is the lead. There is the disclosure. There is the identity of each interest that he has. It is not hidebound. It is not an effort to strip him and force him to disclose everything he owns in the world; but it is a guideline.

As the Senator from Louisiana knows, in his State and my State we have growing timber. Suppose you buy a little piece of timberland with \$5,000. That is what you pay for it. If you cultivate it properly, and just let the timber grow, it will grow, and sometime, not too long distant, perhaps, it will be worth \$10,000. That is when a Senator would put it down, under this rule. When it got to be worth \$20,000, if you did not cut the timber or sell it off, it would still be worth \$10,000 plus; but if you cut it off systematically, you take away, every 5 years, the equivalent of the growth; and there you are, but you are disclosing the nature of the business you are in.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us assume that a Senator owned property before he took his oath of office, and he never acquired any more real estate. Let us say the cost of that property was \$50,000, and today that property is worth \$1 million.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Remember, he did not buy any the year before. Would he have to report it as being worth \$1 million, or \$50,000?

Mr. STENNIS. Well, I think in the first year the Senator is in the Senate, and he makes a report for that year, he has to put down all items of real property or personal property worth \$10,000 or more in value during that preceding year. It makes no difference when it acquired that value; it had it during that preceding year. This requirement is stated on page 6, in subsection (d). That requires a disclosure of the identity of all the avenues of business activity a Senator might have, without requiring that he just tell everything about all of it.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that, as I have previously stated, a Senator would have to report more or less the market value of his property from year to year?

Mr. STENNIS. No. I call attention to lines 12 and 13 on page 6. He must report the identity of each interest in real or personal property having a value of \$10,000 or more which he owned at any time during the preceding year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. So if the land is identified as Black Acre, he would report Black Acre, \$10,000 or more, and that is it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Suppose the land was acquired, not the preceding year, but 30 years before. What then?

Mr. STENNIS. Well, if it is worth \$10,000 or more during the year for which the Senator is reporting it, he just puts it down at \$10,000 plus.

Mr. ELLENDER. Plus whatever?

Mr. STENNIS. Just at more than \$10,000. We never did attempt to require placing any figure on it, above the \$10,000.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I understand the Senator, he is simply saying that a Senator files a report saying, "The following is a list of properties I own which exceed \$10,000 in value: (a) Black Acre; (b) 100 acres of land in a certain place; (c) 500 shares of stock in x company" and so forth.

Mr. STENNIS. That is right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So each one of those items would be expected to have a value of \$10,000 or more. As I understand what the Senator is saying, it does not place a burden on a Senator to arrive at the appraisal of that property; that is between him and the tax collector, to worry about what it is actually worth. But as far as the interest is concerned, it is a matter of reporting the property that he owns, or the interests he has, each one of which exceeds \$10,000.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has stated it correctly all the way through. There is no appraisal he has to make on each of these items, except this: He has to make an appraisal to the extent of saying

it is worth either \$10,000 or more, or less than \$10,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Irrespective of the cost to him?

Mr. STENNIS. Irrespective of the cost to him, and irrespective of the value above \$10,000.

I yield now to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I just wish to make the further point that, as I understand it, referring to the example quoted by the Senator from Louisiana, a Senator does not even have to say "500 shares of x stocks." He just says "stock in x company worth more than \$10,000."

Mr. STENNIS. We use the words:

The identity of each interest in real or personal property having a value of \$10,000 or more—

We refer further to fiduciary relationship.

Those are excellent questions. The purpose of our effort is to obtain a disclosure of all activities in which a Senator is engaged and his various interests if they amount to \$10,000 or more. That information would go on record here for future reference.

Mr. President, I move on now to another of the proposed rules.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, what about liabilities? Do we have to say that we owe X bank \$100,000, and Y bank \$50,000, or do we have to say that we owe more than \$10,000 to banks A, B, and C?

Mr. STENNIS. On page 7, section (f) reads:

The identity of each liability of \$5,000 or more—

I turn now to page 5 of the resolution, proposed rule XLIII entitled, "Political Fund Activity by Officers and Employees."

We were talking about outside employment a moment ago. However, this is pertinent to the political fund activities of officers and employees. This gets right down to the very heart of a Senator's activities because it pertains to campaign funds. And it gets down to the matter of any employee on the Senate floor having anything to do moneywise with the campaign of any Senator or any prospective Senator. It prohibits these employees from taking part in it. That is the substance of the proposal.

It reads:

No officer or employee whose salary is paid by the Senate—

That means officers of the Senate or Senate employees, meaning a Senator's staff as well as Senate staff.

I continue to read:

whose salary is paid by the Senate may receive, solicit, be the custodian of, or distribute any funds in connection with any campaign for the nomination for election, or the election of any individual to be a Member of the Senate or to any other Federal office.

That proposal is rather far-reaching, and it separates the raising and distribution of campaign money from members of the official staff. And it separates from them also the raising of campaign money for a candidate for any Federal office,

referring to things such as testimonial dinners or fund-raising events for the President or Vice President or prospective President or prospective Vice President of the minority party. It literally removes these employees from such activities with one exception that I will emphasize in a minute, and it is a rather far-reaching rule.

A proposal was made not to let the staff members have anything to do with a Senator's reelection. However, we unanimously opposed that on the simple ground that the staff is a necessary part of the operation and must work up the facts on which the Senator acts. The staff must supply the Senator with information. They hold conferences for him with people who come to see him. They are a part of his thinking. This has to be so considering the volume of business we do. How could a Senator present the record he has made on the floor of the Senate and in committees without having at least some of the employees help him make that record and present it to the people? So we totally ruled out the idea of prohibiting staff members from taking part in the campaigns for the nomination or renomination of Senators. Governors run against Senators, incidentally, and they have their staff members participate, and they must have them. They are running on their record, partly, too. So, I do not say that in criticism at all.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I applaud the decision of the select committee in that regard. Some of these employees have their own jobs at stake in that campaign. They are not protected by civil service.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. It is so much a part of the multitudinous duties of a Senator that I would not think of trying to separate them. We think people understand that.

There is a question involved in whether a highly paid staff member should be out raising money. That is sometimes done. There are questions involving other services.

We decided that ought to be prohibited. We decided to put this proposed rule to the Senate, a rule that would prohibit a lot of things that went on prior to the investigation by the Committee on Rules and Administration on the case that is still pending in court. I do not name the case because I do not think the name should be put in the Record.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator has made the point that this takes out the activities of a Senator's personal staff member, but it also takes out any fund-raising activities by members of the Senate committees with which the Senator may be connected.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct, and I think that is important.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, speaking as a member of the minority, on the committees with which I am connected, the majority staff people outnumber the minority by 6, 7, 8, or 10 to 1. I think it is

very wise and proper that the staff members of committees should be forbidden to be active in the raising of funds for their friends.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for the very fine contribution he has made here.

We found that the matter mentioned by the Senator and other matters that are well known to everyone have been abused a great deal.

We made an exception in the sentence beginning on line 8 of page 5.

I read that sentence:

This prohibition does not apply to an assistant to a Senator if the assistant, with the express approval of the Senator, receives the funds solely to transmit them either to the candidate or to the treasurer of a political committee, in accordance with Federal law.

That refers merely to mail coming in with checks enclosed or to people who come by a Senator's office and want to leave a little contribution for his campaign.

Some designated staff member will be eligible to receive that money solely for the purpose of transmitting it on to the Senator.

This cuts pretty hard and hits rather far. A Senator may have an administrative assistant who knows all the Senator's friends in his State. Perhaps by custom, and in a very high mannered way, he has helped to raise money and bring in the campaign funds that are so essential. This proposal would put him out of business.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania. I shall yield to the Senator from Kentucky next.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the Senator from Mississippi and the other members of his committee on bringing this resolution before the Senator. In my opinion, it makes a significant improvement in the standards of ethics which we Members of the Senate will be called upon to comply with in the future.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. The Senator's previous work on this subject was helpful to the committee; I assure him of that. We took advantage of the work he had done. He will find that a good many of these lines originated in his proposed resolution.

Mr. CLARK. I appreciate the Senator's kind words. He will recall that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] also has done fine work in this regard.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, that is true. I am glad to bring that out at this time. I was thinking primarily of the Senator from Pennsylvania because he is on his feet.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from New Jersey and I are in accord with the views expressed by the Senator from Kentucky in his supplemental views. We believe they are wise and desirable. We understand that the Senator from Kentucky is not in the mood to propose amendments himself, but the Senator from New Jersey and I would like to bring such amendments forward. We would like to have them printed and have the opportunity to circulate them. May I have the assurance of the Senator from Missis-

issippi that the resolution we are considering will not be pressed to a vote today?

Mr. STENNIS. Oh, of course. The committee wants the resolution to be fully understood and agreed to only after it is fully understood. However, we hope that there will not be prolonged debate.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Pennsylvania are not accustomed to filibustering.

Mr. STENNIS. But they know how to when it is necessary. I have found that out. They know how to filibuster if they think it is necessary.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, first I shall comment on the reference to me made by the Senator from Pennsylvania with respect to the disclosure rule recommended. I made my case for public disclosure in committee. I have stated my continuing position in my separate views, and, as I have said, I shall adhere to that position and support public disclosure.

I shall return now to the rule dealing with the activities of an employee in connection with elections. It should be emphasized that if an employee performs what I would term a "ministerial act"—simply the act, in effect, of receiving and transferring a contribution to a proper authority—it is not forbidden by the rule. But it must be made clear that it is intended that the employee transfer the contribution to the Senator, who, under the law, must report, or to a political committee which, under the law, must report.

One problem connected with this situation is that of defects in the present Corrupt Practices Act, which does not require every political committee to report. But the Senate has passed a very improved Corrupt Practices Act, which is still languishing in the House. That Senate version would close the loopholes. It requires every political committee and every Senator to report political contributions annually, rather than only when the Senator becomes a candidate.

It is intended by the committee in this section dealing with employees that an employee shall not solicit political contributions, that he shall not distribute them, or have their custody. An employee can only, when so designated, receive such contributions and transfer them to the Senator or a political committee, both having a duty to report publicly.

The proposed rule grew out of experience in the Baker investigation. I recall that when the Rules Committee finished its work, I recommended its adoption at that time. It has been improved by the committee. Its purpose is to remove the source of corruption, or possibility or temptation of corruption and influence.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I especially thank him on behalf of the committee for his far-reaching contribution, as well as for his fine influence with the members of the committee in preparing these recommendations.

The recommendations may look simple on paper, but I assure Senators that it is difficult to put everything together with fairness to everyone and with fairness to the Senate as an institution. All of us thought of the Senate as an insti-

tution and not as an ordinary corporate body. It is the people's institution.

I thank the Senator again for his remarks.

I also wish to thank with emphasis the Senator from New Jersey, for the work he has done on the subject. We had before us the resolution he introduced and what he had said, and it was indeed helpful.

I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I join my colleagues in expressing gratitude to the Senator and his committee for the hard work they have done on this matter.

I have a question at the moment with respect to this particular section, and I would be grateful for an answer to it or further development of it.

How far does this exception go? That is my question, really. Suppose an assistant meets the second sentence of subsection 1 by transmitting all the money that he gets either to the Senator or to a committee, and in either case it must be reported. If he does that, may he be an active solicitor of funds?

Mr. STENNIS. No. This rule has been drawn carefully. It uses the words "receive, solicit, be the custodian of, or distribute any funds in connection with any campaign." None of those words is used in the exception. It just says "receives the funds solely to transmit them." And he must have the prior approval of his Senator. He can only transmit them then to the Senator, presumably as they come in, or to the treasurer of a political committee.

Mr. CASE. So the only exception is what the Senator from Kentucky referred to as the ministerial act of taking the money, which he had nothing to do with collecting, but which came into his hands as the office head or something of that sort, and handing it over to the Senator or a committee?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. Presumably, whoever opens the mail would automatically pass it to his desk, and then he would transmit it, under this clause, and that is it.

Mr. CASE. There are people who have been associated with us for years and years—and with our campaigns for that length of time, too—and who, as the Senator remarked earlier, are as familiar with the constituencies we represent as we are, and in many cases more so. It has been the practice of many Members of the Senate, when election time comes around, to lift a person from his staff, eliminate him from the staff, and have him paid by a campaign committee.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. CASE. Activity of such a person, when he is not on the Senate payroll, would not be covered by this language, I take it.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. We could not cover it. If he disassociates himself from being a Senate employee, whose salary is paid by the Senate, he is not covered by this rule.

Mr. CASE. I do not see how it could be covered.

Mr. STENNIS. That is a separate jurisdiction. Whenever they do that, they are no longer staff members.

I believe that some Senators would feel they have to do that, or want to do it, at least. But that is a different matter.

I believe that this is a wise rule, every-thing considered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I join my colleagues in expressing commendation to the distinguished Senator for dealing with a difficult and complicated subject, in which fine distinctions have to be drawn. He and his associates on the committee have done it very well.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator, and I accept the compliment on behalf of the entire committee. We worked together.

Mr. COTTON. The only item in the entire set of recommendations that troubles the Senator from New Hampshire is the recommendation that has just been under discussion. I can readily appreciate the reason for it. I can understand why employees of the Senate should be precluded from campaign activities and certainly from soliciting funds.

However, I believe that a Senator's own administrative assistant in most cases occupies a peculiar relationship of complete intimacy with the Senator and with all his political activities.

Usually he is a person of longstanding service with the Senator. He almost invariably comes from the home State of the Senator. In the matter of soliciting funds, if any one person were excepted that person might be the Senator's administrative assistant. If his activities were restricted to the State which the Senator represents, it would seem to me to be a sufficient safeguard. This matter of having a staff running around in this city or that city, up in New York, or somewhere else, soliciting funds is one thing; but what is done in the Senator's own State is another matter.

For instance, my administrative assistant was for many years administrative assistant to the late Senator Bridges. He has been with me ever since the death of Senator Bridges. He knows New Hampshire as few other people do. I do not doubt that the citizens of Mississippi and New Jersey, and other States, are very generous and they might even press contributions on Senators. But New Hampshire Yankees are a little different breed. A Senator's local finance committee might be made up of bankers, but it is pretty hard to find a banker or anyone else in a given community who knows that John Jones regularly gives \$25 or \$50 to a Senator's campaign, when requested, and yet it is necessary for someone to go to such supporters and remind them of their commitment or previous practice. Additionally, bankers and other business executives have limited time to solicit small contributions.

That is the kind of legwork for which one has to depend on someone who knows the people and someone closely associated with them. I cannot see much danger of scandal in proper conduct from the activity of an administrative assistant confined to the State, because what he does there is pretty well known. It is in the public view and he is dealing with

constituents. I almost wish it had been possible to make that a carefully couched exception. I merely mention that point, but it is not a serious matter.

In my opinion the entire report is an excellent contribution.

(At this point, Mr. MONTROYA assumed the chair.)

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall yield in just a moment.

I emphasized a few moments ago the intimacy and need for those persons to help the Senator in his campaign, and the record there as far as that went.

However, on the matter of administrative assistants, or one of equal tenure in his office, we decided that the Senate had better make a new start and handle those matters in a nonofficial way. This, of course, applies only to campaign funds; that is, when the campaign is more or less in progress. Of course, that is a relative term, too, according to State law, but that was the unanimous view of the committee.

If any hardship is worked on anyone we certainly regret it greatly but at the same time we thought, all matters considered, we should make a new start.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I am happy to commend the chairman and his committee for a fine piece of work.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. With respect to the inquiry of the Senator from New Jersey, I would like to know what happens after the administrative assistant has been off the staff. Would he lose his pension rights? For instance, I had an assistant for 20 years.

Mr. STENNIS. I think not.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. The custom is, I think, that people are taken off the staff for the minimum amount, so that their salary is not being paid by the Government, but the continuity of service is maintained. This is the customary practice.

Mr. STENNIS. Then, he would not lose.

Mr. ANDERSON. He would not.

Mr. STENNIS. He would not lose rights he had already accrued. When the continuity picked up or when he was restored to the staff I think it would continue to accrue. The time he was off the staff would not be covered, of course, if that course were taken.

Mr. ANDERSON. He would have the same rights. In 4 months, 5 months, or 6 months he could come back on the staff with the same rights; or has he lost his pension rights?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not think he loses his accrued rights such as health and insurance benefits. During those 4 months that he was off the staff he would not be covered, but he would certainly have his accrued rights toward retirement and they would be reinstated when he became active again.

Mr. ANDERSON. I commend the Senator from New Hampshire for his state-

We all trust these administrative assistants. We think they are fine people, and they are. I do not think we should jeopardize their position by taking them off the payroll for 3 months or 6 months.

Mr. STENNIS. That would be a matter of judgment for the Senator himself. I am sure that, as a possibility, it could be done.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I wish to be sure that I am right about this. With reference to a Senator's employees and particularly his principal assistants, being exempt from the Hatch Act, is it clear there is nothing in the recommendations of the committee would preclude such assistants remaining on a Senator's payroll so that they would not lose any time in gaining retirement; and they still could participate in the Senator's campaign in any way except raising money. Is that right?

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is a fair statement of the proposed rule.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. But they are taken out of this raising of money.

Proposed rule XLIII reads:

No officer or employee whose salary is paid by the Senate may receive, solicit, be custodian of, or distribute any funds—

And that is what we are talking about—

in connection with any campaign for the nomination for election—

They would be cut off from that except to transmit, as I have said.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. I believe the point emphasized by the Senator from New Mexico is very well taken, because even though they may not lose their retirement, they would delay their retirement. I believe that almost any administrative assistant would be unhappy about having retirement interrupted.

Mr. STENNIS. That is true.

Mr. COTTON. Second, the situation has now come to the point where an administrative assistant gets nearly as much salary as a Senator does.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. I wish to get in this plug. I do not care if the Senate insists on our disclosing our worth. I am worth so little it would not bother me. However, I am in no position to take an administrative assistant off the payroll and pay him myself out of any funds I have, or pay him during the interim campaign.

As I have said, I wanted to make sure that soliciting money for the campaign is the only matter precluded.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is absolutely correct on that point. The committee carefully avoided intruding on the Senator in that way.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask, in order to understand better myself, what the committee does recommend and what it does not recommend in further regard to the question posed by the dis-

tinguished Senator from New Mexico. It would be my feeling that if an administrative assistant did not enter into the collection of funds, as is spelled out by rule XLIII on page 5, there would be no reason why he should have to suspend participation as a particular employee of a Senator during the time of a campaign. In my case, that may be some time, and I may not ever run again. I may. I am not saying that, but assuming that the average Senator will be running again, it would seem to me to be unjust and unfair to an administrative assistant to expect that he should voluntarily forgo the benefits of normal remuneration to which he would be entitled.

Mr. STENNIS. It is clear to the Senator that there is no prohibition on any staff member any time during a campaign. Their pay is not to be stopped or any benefits denied in any way unless they go out and violate the rule about money, receiving or soliciting funds for an election; otherwise, they are free to help out with the record, and the campaign, and to help get up speeches, and so forth. A Senator can go to a committee staff member and get his help to delve into the record as to what a Senator did about a certain bill, or what the issues were on certain committee votes. Senators have to have access to all of that. The rule would not prohibit that. It just takes him out of fund raising.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in what I am about to say I mean to be as impersonal and objective as I can. The rule is limited to the handling of campaign money, to the solicitation of such money by an employee, to its custody and distribution all of which is prohibited. It states expressly that an employee may receive funds only in a ministerial way, merely to transmit funds to the proper person, to a Senator or a campaign committee, required to report publicly.

Questions have been asked as to what the committee would recommend on specific situations. I do not think that is our duty at this time to prejudge every situation. We are dealing with a specific question—that of the handling of campaign funds by an employee. There is a background—an actual situation—the Baker case—which caused us to recommend the rule. We know, having been in politics—all of us, for many years—that the use of campaign funds always poses a problem. There are loopholes in the Corrupt Practices Act which the Senate is now making an effort to correct. We have based our recommendations very much on the unanimous decision of the Senate last year when it voted to amend a new Corrupt Practices Act.

I would say that this question of how many employees are used in a campaign is one we cannot deal with now. It seems to address itself to the judgment and the sense of propriety of each Senate. Speaking for myself, I do not think it would be appropriate if we turned our entire office to running a campaign. I believe there are limits. But that question is not before us at this time.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

I want now to yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. He is about ready to make his remarks on the bill as

a whole, and I want to yield to him as soon as I can.

I yield to the Senator now for a question.

Mr. BENNETT. I left the Chamber to try and get a definitive answer to the question raised by the Senator from New Mexico. If an employee leaves the employ of the Senate temporarily, his benefits, under retirement and insurance policies, stop subject to the following exceptions:

His retirement benefits stop the day he leaves. His life insurance continues for 31 days and then stops. His health and accident insurance continues for 31 days after the end of the month in which he stops. But when he returns to the payroll, he can reinstate all of these without any penalty. Thus, all he loses is the coverage or the benefits in the case of retirement, the entire period he is off, and in the case of the insurance, the period minus the grace period that follows after his leaving.

Mr. STENNIS. Very good. I thank the Senator very much for the added information.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, but first let me say that all members of the committee are more than willing to try to answer any questions we possibly can. I think those present in the Chamber show an interest which makes us eager to try to answer all their questions.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the committee has done a very fine job. I am concerned about this particular point, however. Speaking from experience, when a Senator runs for office and he is successful, he offers a good job at least to one person who has helped him get elected. That person is the one who has been most helpful and most instrumental in getting him elected. Thus, he usually brings in one person with him who knows the State or the area the Senator serves, and who understands how to carry on a campaign and what the problems are. That one person is usually the one the Senator can trust and rely upon the most. That person is usually the top secretary or administrative assistant. Then, when the Senator goes to campaign for office, that is the one person he knows and needs the most.

Under this regulation, it will be necessary to take off the payroll the particular person the Senator can trust and rely upon most. Usually, if a Senator has an administrative assistant, he has explicit confidence in that administrative assistant.

Unless there is some abuse being sought to overcome here, of which I am not aware, I really feel that there should be provision for one person on a Senator's staff to work on a campaign, to do anything in the course of a campaign that he can do, whether to pay an employee, run a sound truck, pay for a bill at a hotel, or pay for a radio or television broadcast. Of course, there are ways that this could be overcome, by taking that person off the payroll and giving him a leave of absence, which the good, and loyal employee would agree to, I am sure; there is no doubt about that, in my mind.

But I would wonder why we would want to do that, because it would seem to me that if a Senator is going to be elected to public office, if he is worthy to serve again, he has to have someone upon whom he can rely and trust to get the job done, and that person is usually his administrative assistant.

I question whether disqualifying the administrative assistant from doing all the things that he is doing nowadays, and does traditionally in connection with a campaign, from doing everything within his power to help his boss win reelection will achieve anything of merit.

The best administrative assistants usually quit if their bosses meet defeat anyhow. They would not work for someone else. That being the case, I would certainly hope that the committee would consider the possibility of saying that one person—just one—in an office could be the handyman or the Man Friday to do the job in a campaign which an administrative assistant does 6 years in office, being the jack-of-all-trades, and the troubleshooter that does almost anything he can to help his boss. Otherwise, it would seem to me, we would impose an additional burden on administrative assistants for no really good reason.

I am not aware that any administrative assistant in the course of a campaign has done anything besides providing loyal support for the man who is his superior and his employer. It does seem to me that this would create something of a problem when the Senator cannot use a single employee.

I would think it would be adequate to meet the problem, from the viewpoint of this Senator, if one employee in a Senator's office could be used to help him in his campaign. As we know, most of us have to run for reelection, and that is one of the principal problems of the job, if one wishes to continue in office. He has to get organized and find people all over his State and know what they will do to help him and what can be expected and where to solicit funds. It is discouraging, if one is out trying to obtain money for his campaign, to go to someone and then get cursed out. It is absolutely discouraging. I have been at both ends of that situation. So if the assistant knows whom the Senator can talk to, it will save a lot of humiliating experiences. If he knows that the man is angry at the boss, for which reason the man is not only not going to contribute, but is actually going to contribute to the man running against his boss, the administrative assistant knows that situation and can say, "Don't talk to him. Go talk to the man across the street. He may help you." These people are needed in campaigns.

I hope the committee would consider accepting an amendment that would exempt just one person in the office to help the Senator in his campaign. If we do not do it, we will find a way to meet the problem, but I think it would be more appropriate, and would not meet with an ethical problem, to make that person available to him. As it is now, the ethical problem works the other way. It is expected that the administrative assistant would help his boss get reelected, just as

it is expected that a Senator's wife and his associates and friends would help him to be reelected.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I yield now to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, there is another point I would like to call to the Senator's attention along that line. There is a practice in the Senate of paying to the survivor of a deceased employee who is in the employment of a Senator or the Senate at the time he dies the amount of 1 month's pay for each of the first 6 years of satisfactory service, and one-half month's salary for each of the next 12 years of satisfactory service, not exceeding a year's pay. If, under the situation that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has just explained, the Senator's administrative assistant were taken off the Senator's payroll and put on a private payroll and he died during that interim period, his survivors would completely lose the benefit of that payment. If he had been a 20-year servant of the Senate, the survivors would lose 1 year's pay. It seems to me to be patently unfair to create a situation like that, which would, in effect, deprive that individual or his survivors of the benefits they would otherwise be entitled to had he remained on the payroll of the Senator during that period of time.

I would hope the Senator would give consideration to the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana along that line.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I think the facts as he has stated them are correct, with reference to the benefits for the survivors.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The Senator has been so patient.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. There is one other aspect that I hope would be considered. There would be a difficult situation; where a very thin line might be drawn, if someone was trying to make trouble for a Senator, or raised questions, or in any way went to the courts about the conduct of his campaign. This involves the fact that the administrative assistant is bound to make voluminous contacts around his own State. If any amendment were offered on the exemption for the soliciting of funds, I would think it would be confined to the home State. I think an exception as to anything outside would be dangerous.

My assistant or the Senator's assistant knows those persons who have expressed support of a Senator's work or those with whom he has been friendly through the years. The assistant goes up to John Doe and says, "The Senator is in a hard fight. He needs all the help he can get. Will you help him in this town?"

John Doe says, "I know that. I want to help the Senator. My law practice is too heavy. I am too busy to go around ringing doorbells or acting as chairman, but I still want to help him, and here is a check for \$100." The assistant brings back the check to the Senator or his campaign committee.

It would be extremely easy, and in perfect innocence, for the person who gave

the check to say, "Senator So-and-So's assistant was here, asking for help, and I sent \$100 to the Senator. I hope you will send something."

Right off, there is a question of whether that donation was solicited or was not solicited, when the assistant goes in and says, "The Senator has a hard campaign. He wants help. Can you help us? Will you do some work here?" and the man says, "I am too busy, but I want to help him. Here is \$100."

By and by, somewhere, in some tribunal, if questions are raised, it will be very difficult to draw the line. The assistant of a Senator knows the people of his State. As the Senator from Louisiana has just said, he knows who the Senator's friends are. He knows who came to his office. He knows who have offered their support. He goes to them.

It seems to me this is worth considering. I would not go so far as to amend this resolution because I think the committee has done a fine job. It is easy to pick flaws, and this is not a life and death matter. But if one person were exempted from the requirements about raising funds, provided the exemption was geographical and extended only to the boundaries of his State, it seems to me it would avoid many cases of possible ambiguity and misunderstanding about whether or not the person had solicited a contribution or whether he simply went there and brought it back. I shall not say further.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, if it is agreeable to the Senate, I would like to move now to page 4, proposed rule XLII, which has to do with contributions. I shall be fairly brief on this section.

If Senators who are following me as I explain the resolution will turn to page 4 of Senate Resolution 266, I shall read and comment:

1. A Senator may accept a contribution from—

(a) a fundraising event organized and held in his behalf—

That includes so-called testimonial dinners and events of that kind—

Provided—

(1) he has expressly given his approval of the fundraising event to the sponsors before any funds were raised;

That is merely to be certain that someone will not sponsor a fundraising event without the Senator's consent. To come within the rule, the Senator will have to know in advance what is proposed to be done and to give his consent thereto. That is only the first step. I continue to read:

(2) he receives a complete and accurate accounting of the source, amounts, and disposition of the funds raised;

That is, he must have brought to him a complete and accurate accounting of the source, amounts, and disposition of the funds raised. A report must be made by the committee, or whatever group it is, showing the sources of the funds and the amount that went for expenses, and then the amount that is delivered to the Senator. That is a way of raising money. It is done for individuals, it is done for the political parties, it is done for the

congressional campaign committees of the House and of the Senate. It takes place in the form of \$25-a-plate dinners, \$50-a-plate dinners, \$100-a-plate dinners, or whatever the event may be, or whatever one may wish to call it. The committee decided that that is part of the precampaign activities, before the campaign itself, and should not be excluded or outlawed, but should be regulated.

We have tried to put the Senator right in the middle, to start with, because he will then know what is required of him and can stop the activity before it starts, or he can accept it.

Another contribution that is described is one from an individual or an organization, provided the Senator makes a complete and accurate accounting of the source, amount, and disposition of the funds received. If someone or some organization contributes \$1,000 and says, "The Senator has been diligent, has worked hard, and has worked extra hours. We believe it is better for the country that he continue in office. Here is \$1,000. It is a contribution; it is not a gift." I shall come to the gift part later. The Senator may be told, "Use this contribution in some way to carry on your office or to carry on the expenses that you incur. This is the way we feel about it."

We are still talking about contributions. There is this limitation:

The Senator may use the contribution only to—

(a) influence his nomination for election, or his election;

Senators will understand that this is not necessarily limited to the actual campaign. It is intended to cover precampaign periods as well. If, for example, he is putting out newsletters or television films, cutting radio messages, sending out souvenirs or photographs, sending telegrams of congratulations, flowers for anniversaries, or doing any of a whole host of things that go to make up those little, intimate, personal relationships between a man in public life and his constituents, those acts could be said to influence his nomination for election or his election, even though it is 3 or 4 years off.

(b) defray the reasonable expenses, incurred or contemplated, of his office;

Then here is the final condition:

and shall not use directly or indirectly any part of any contribution for any other purposes.

In other words, under this rule, a Senator simply cannot use the money for any other purpose. He cannot use it for any personal purpose, for the expenses of his family, or for anything except as listed here.

I wish to comment for a moment on the words "reasonable expenses, incurred or contemplated, of his office."

The ideal situation, of course, would be to have the allowances for the operation of a Senator's office sufficient to pay for all of the costs of operating it. I have always believed that that should be the rule, recognizing how hard it is to apply it properly to every Senator's office. I think all of us have felt that way.

I remember when I was a new Senator, soon after I came to the Senate, there came here a very sincere Senator, who has since passed away, the late former Senator from New York, Mr. Lehman. He was a hard-working, industrious kind of fellow. I would see him day after day and night after night at his labors. I have understood that he paid out of his pocket around \$50,000 a year for additional clerk hire, just for things directly connected with carrying out the official functions of his office; though of course there is always bound to be some overlapping with things that are semi-official or even personal in nature. Nevertheless, New York is a huge State, and I did not think that that was right. It happened that he was able and willing to do it. Suppose he had not been, according to his conscientious concept of what his responsibilities were, because his allowances were not sufficient. He would have been a very unhappy man.

With all deference to the Committee on Rules and Administration—and I know they are very busy—we would like to see them undertake a real study of what the allowances for a Senator's office should be, and then have the allowances made on that basis. But until that is done, the Senate must be run, and there should be some way for a Senator to raise money from people who are willing to contribute, to cover the reasonable expenses incurred or contemplated in operating his office.

What is reasonable, of course, is relative. We did not wish to put blanket approval on whatever a Senator might say, regardless of the facts, or to state a limit, such as \$50,000 or even \$100,000 in the case of the very largest States, but felt that what is reasonable should depend on the showing the Senator made. We recognized the principle that these funds should be usable for the reasonable expenses, incurred or contemplated, of a Senator's office.

When the Rules Committee and Congress do make allowances that are deemed more nearly sufficient to take care of such burdens, then I would think, as Senators, we might favor changing the rules so as to eliminate this provision for use for office expenses.

The remainder of the limiting language is that contributions shall not be used for any other purpose.

At this point, another question arises. Suppose someone gives a Senator a personal present of some kind. To use a personal illustration, I once gave the former Senator from Virginia, Senator Robertson, a hunting coat, because I had been out hunting with him so often and had enjoyed his stories as well as the sport. The coat cost \$30, I believe. He is still using that coat.

After the resolution was written, I suddenly realized that under its terms that sort of gift would have been prohibited, unless language were included exempting such gifts.

Not wishing to encourage anything improper, the committee covered that situation in this way:

All gifts in the aggregate amount or value of \$50 or more received by a Senator from any single source during a year, except a gift from

his spouse, child, or parent, and except a contribution under sections 1 and 2, shall be reported under rule XLIV.

In other words, that takes care of all the little tokens exchanged between friends. Sometimes the most valued friend makes the smallest gift. We did not wish to outlaw all those little things, which add up to a lot of appreciation and friendship in return, worth far more than their intrinsic value.

We provided that anything worth more than \$50 would have to be reported. I believe that covers the situation, and would provide a record of important gifts, and at the same time the door of friendship would not be closed.

Mr. President, I believe that fairly well covers the situation on these contributions. I am happy to yield now to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who worked hard on this rule and helped materially and substantially in its writing.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I should like to emphasize one condition of the rule which, I consider very important.

It is correct, is it not, that fund raising events for political purposes must be annually reported to the Secretary of the Senate under the disclosure rule.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. That is covered on page 8, beginning on line 5. I think it would be helpful if the Senator would read that into the Record.

Mr. COOPER. Page 8, section (3) (a) of the rules dealing with disclosure provides:

The accounting required by rule XLII for all contributions received by him during the preceding year, except that contributions in the aggregate amount or value of less than \$50 received from any single source during the reporting period may be totaled without further itemization;

Is it correct that if a fund-raising dinner or event is held for a Senator and properly held under the recommended rules, there is, nevertheless, a duty on the part of the Senator to make a public disclosure each year of the event and all funds collected?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The Senator has just read the rule covering that requirement.

Mr. COOPER. There is no present provision of law that requires a Senator to do so.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. That was one of the reasons that we wrote this provision as we did, so that it would be reported and disclosed.

While the Senator is on the subject, that applies not only to the fundraising mentioned on line 4, page 4, but it also covers the item mentioned in line 12 on page 4.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. Second, the value and source of all gifts of more than \$50 must be reported annually and publicly.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. With respect to the former example mentioned by the Senator, the reporting and disclosure must be public.

Mr. COOPER. If a Senator receives contributions to assist in the operation of his office, those funds and their source must also be reported to the Secretary of the Senate annually and publicly disclosed.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. Mr. COOPER. I thought it should be made very clear that there must be a public disclosure of such funds.

With respect to the collection of funds for the operation of a Senator's office, I agree with the senior Senator from Mississippi.

I believe the proper procedure would be for the Senate to provide adequate funds for each Senator to conduct his office, and if there are differences in the requirements of different States, with respect to size, volume of business, and so forth, these needs should be taken into consideration and provided for.

I hope that the requirement concerning reporting will be agreed to by the Senate, and will lead to action by the Senate to provide the necessary funds for each Senator's office. I must say for myself that, recognizing the difficulty of Senators who come from large States—and from States which are far from the Capital of our country—a problem that I do not have, I believe the practice is not correct, and funds should be provided by the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much for the strong point he has made.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, referring to page 4, line 17, I ask if that is not supposed to read "influence his nomination for election, or his reelection"?

Mr. STENNIS. If a Senator has been appointed for less than a 2-year term, technically he would not be running for reelection. It is "nomination for election, or his election."

Mr. ALLOTT. I see the context in which the language is drawn. It is the nomination or the election.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. With reference to page 4, line 19, the Senator has discussed this matter and I am referring to the words "of his office." As I understand it, the select committee is not referring there specifically to the physical aspects of the office alone.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator mentioned all of the outside expenses—telegrams, flowers, and so forth. Did the Senator have in mind that it would include also the entertainment of constituents?

Mr. STENNIS. I think a reasonable amount would certainly be all right for the entertainment of constituents. It is something that goes with the office. It depends on the extent of it. A Senator can pay it all up to a point. However, if it is extended to large groups, it is going to run into a large amount of money. And I think that we could not approve of something without limit.

We finally picked up the word "reasonable." However, it would certainly include a reasonable amount for the entertainment of constituents.

Mr. ALLOTT. It would certainly include the legitimate traveling expenses to the constituency and back.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. That is one of the large items of expense.

Not enough allowance is provided for the plane trips.

It is the common experience of most Senators that they have to go back to their States on official or semiofficial business even if no allowance is provided for this purpose. This is one of the most reasonable items, I think, that it applies to.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I will pay my respects to the select committee later. I know that the Senator wants to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I am not trying to hold the floor to the exclusion of any other Senator. This is a matter of explaining the measure.

Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has some remarks to deliver, and I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Utah for such time as he requires without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CODES OF ETHICS BIND ONLY THE ETHICAL

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, in the division of authority between the chairman and the vice chairman, the chairman has assumed the responsibility of discussing the details and interpretations of very specific provisions in the law.

I should like to hold the Senate's attention for a while on some of the philosophical problems we face, particularly with respect to rule 44, which is probably the most serious and the most controversial part of our work which will be discussed after I finish, or maybe tomorrow.

Mr. President, the Senate now has before it, for consideration and action, the report of its Select Committee on Standards and Conduct and an accompanying resolution which would add four new rules to the present rules of the Senate.

The opening statement of the chairman of that committee, Senator STENNIS of Mississippi, lays a solid foundation for an objective and dispassionate discussion of the merits and effectiveness of these recommendations with which the committee has been confronted for more than 2 years.

As the vice chairman of the group, which has worked in an atmosphere completely devoid of partisanship, I want first to express my complete support of the resolution, and then to present my own feelings with respect to the specifics of the four proposed new rules.

Anyone who attempts the task assigned to your committee must recognize at once that he faces a fundamental dilemma. Should he try for broad, unspecific statements of basic ethical ideals, such as are found in most of the world's religions, or should he try to anticipate and list every possible type of misconduct? If the former approach had ever been successful through the centuries, there would be no need now for a more limited restatement of these fundamental principles intended to effect only 100 Senators. The second approach, an attempt completely to delineate every possible source of violation, has also been attempted and has been equally unsuccessful.

Even though I am not a lawyer, legal Latin has always fascinated me and as

I have pondered this dilemma, my mind has turned to the twin phrases, *malum in se*—that which is evil by its own nature—and *malum prohibitum*—that which becomes an evil or offense by legal process, as expressed in the law.

While the distinction between these two kinds of evils may seem clear philosophically, in many cases they actually overlap in practice. The evil of murder provides us with a good example. Every person with any moral sense at all will agree that murder is evil by its own nature, but in order to handle all the practical problems that it creates for a society ruled by law, it has been necessary to define the elements by which the essential crime of murder can be interpreted in degree according to the circumstances in which it is committed. By this process we add an element of the idea of "*malum prohibitum*" to the more basic moral concept of "*malum in se*."

Of course, I know that there are many forms of "*malum prohibitum*" law like parking limits that have no moral or ethical content, and since we are here considering standards of ethical conduct, they are not relevant to this discussion.

Speaking still of these two concepts of evil, there is another important factor in their relationship—the factor of the distinctive and personal moral concepts by which each of us guides his own conduct. This personal code of ethics is a function of the whole experience of each person, his family traditions, his religious heritage, his education, and his lifelong experience. This whole individual, personal background creates, for each of us, a personal interpretation of what is "*malum in se*," evil by its very nature. Each Senator possesses this personal code, and brings it with him to the Senate. In addition to his code, each of us also has established a pattern of mixed success and failure as he has tried to live by it.

If the personal "*malum in se*" codes of all Senators were at a high level, and each of us had a good record of success in living by our codes, and, more importantly, if the people of the country had faith that this were true, there would have been no need for our committee or this report. But, because there is some doubt that all these assumptions are true, the committee has been created and charged to write standards of conduct for the Senate. This report is the first action taken by it in the discharge of that responsibility. In a very real sense, it is the answer to a demand that we try to add the pressure of the concept of "*malum prohibitum*" to actions that should be recognizable as "*malum in se*." To put it another way, and in English, we are asked to write rules that will specifically forbid actions by a Senator whose propriety the people should have been able to take for granted.

This is not easy to do, nor can any such attempt ever be wholly successful, human nature being what it is. On this point, Paul's observation to the Corinthians—II Corinthians 3:6—is significant. You remember he said, "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." Another observation on human nature whose author is unknown to me also belongs here. Someone has said, "Codes of ethics bind only the ethical."

No matter how hard we try to anticipate and cover every contingency, no matter how hard we try to tie down the definition of such evils by the letter of our suggested new rules, we can never chain the human spirit or destroy its ingenuity. In the end, each Senator must still make the ultimate moral and ethical decision which will shape his own conduct. The more we particularize, the more reliance we put on the dead letter of our rules, the more validity we give to the classic defense, represented in the words Shakespeare put in the mouth of Shylock, "Is it so nominated in the bond?"

In Shakespeare's story, that defense could not be allowed to stand unchallenged, and, for us even though these rules are adopted, there will be a need for the committee and the Senate to interpret and apply them whenever charges of wrongdoing are made. The mere adoption of these rules is no solution to the problem.

Two of the four proposed new rules are intended to guide the conduct of employees, but even here the ultimate decision on a "*malum in se*" basis rests with the Senator, or supervisor because his approval of any activity is either implicitly or explicitly required. If he authorizes, condones, or ignores any violation of the rules, he becomes an accessory in a moral sense.

In the case of proposed rule 41, this involves the Senator's judgment on the inconsistency—or shall we say conflict of interest?—between Senate employment and an outside job held by a Senate employee.

The Senator is also involved as an accessory in any violation of proposed rule 43, since he would be the ultimate beneficiary of any funds thus raised.

Proposed rule 42, by its nature, is a tighter "*malum prohibitum*" than 41 or 43. But it also has its areas of conscious decision by the Senator on a "*malum in se*" basis when he comes to use the funds collected if a member of his staff has been involved in the collection. Here the inescapably indefinite words are, "reasonable expenses" and "use indirectly."

But it is when we come to consider proposed rule 44 that we face our most serious problems, and they are many.

The earlier Senate debate and editorial discussion of disclosure had made it perfectly clear that the concern here is with the very conceptual roots of our service as Senators, as restated in the preamble to the committee's resolution:

First. The ideal concept of public office, expressed by the words, "A public office is a public trust," signifies that the officer has been entrusted with public power by the people; that the officer holds this power in trust to be used only for their benefit and never for the benefit of himself or of a few; and that the officer must never conduct his own affairs so as to infringe on the public interest. All official conduct of Members of the Senate should be guided by this paramount concept of public office. This is the preamble to the resolution.

The shorthand phrase for this problem is "conflict of interest." This phrase had its birth in another unit of our tri-

partite system of government—the courts. Here its meaning is clear—and limited; violators are relatively easy to detect and punish, since most court actions are adversary proceedings. In the practice of law, this phrase says that no lawyer can be on both sides of the same case at the same time.

The concept that conflict of interest is evil was later moved to the executive departments where it took on a different connotation. Here it means that no executive or administrator with power to make personal decisions or to influence the decisions of a superior may make a personal financial profit therefrom. But in the Senate, every one of us lives and works in a constant climate of conflict of interest and except in the rarest of situations, no one has the power to enrich himself solely by his own actions.

What do I mean by living in a constant climate of conflict of interest? The evidence is obvious. The very election process that brings us here is a conflict and, therefore, a large proportion of the people we represent after we get here opposed us in the election and many can be expected to go on disagreeing and oppose us again if we run for reelection. Every vote we cast makes some of our constituents happy, and some unhappy. Often the interests of our States conflict with what representatives of other States sincerely believe is the interest of their States or the national interest. Committees, organizations, groups, even companies and individuals, bring their conflicts to us to be resolved, and those whose position we do not uphold are never convinced that our decision was fair.

The preamble to the resolution provides "the officer must never conduct his own affairs so as to infringe on the public interest." Who defines the public interest in each vote we cast? The people affected by that vote, of course, and over the years, I have learned how they arrive at that definition. It is very simple. "The public interest," they say, "is my interest. If you vote against me, you must have voted against the public interest." And, if those we disappoint are angry enough, or partisan enough, some of them will inevitably try to read some reprehensible motivation into our votes. When people are in this mood, the place they tend to look first for that motivation is in the Senator's private life. In such a situation, there is too often the temptation to say, "He has sold out." The followup to that idea is, "if we only knew all about his property and income, we could soon find out how he benefited and who paid him off." This in turn generates the cry, "Full disclosure" and when a Senator declines to lay out his private financial affairs to public view, these same critics are led naturally to say, "He must have something to hide."

Mr. President (Mr. HATFIELD in the chair), to weary you with another literary quotation, Gen. Lew Wallace, author of the American classic, "Ben Hur," wrote in another novel, "Beauty is altogether in the eye of the beholder." In the context of this discussion, I think we can say with some assurance that too often in politics "Evil is altogether in the eye of the beholder."

This kind of an attack must be based on an assumption that axiomatically there must always be a conflict of interest between a Senator's income and investments on the one hand, and his public trust on the other, and that in such a case the Senator will always act to benefit himself financially if he can.

All of this talk of conflict of interest in the activities of a Senator leads us to the dilemma which this committee was created to resolve. Mr. President, at what point do you draw the line between the activities of a Senator as a public trustee, which should be open to public scrutiny, and his rights to privacy as a citizen? And after you have drawn that line, how can you penetrate the privacy you have allowed him to preserve when it becomes necessary to get information about charges of wrongdoing that have been made?

Rule XLIV, over which the committee labored hardest and longest, is an attempt to meet that assignment. The three principles upon which it is built are very simple.

First. Any money that comes to us because we are Senators should be publicly reported.

Second. A complete record of all meaningful information about a Senator's private, non-Senate-connected income and assets should be deposited by him in the hands of a responsible public official, but sealed against all unauthorized curiosity.

Third. If charges are ever made involving his private financial affairs which, if true, might bring him or the Senate itself into disrepute, the Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct, by a majority vote of its members must be able to gain access to these sealed reports and, under rules which provided proper safeguards to the Senator involved, be free to use them in making its necessary decisions.

When I first came to the Senate, many Senate financial records were not made public, such as the wages paid by a Senator to his staff and the amounts each Senator spent on official travel. By now, there are no such hidden figures. In accordance with this accepted practice, the committee decided that any income coming to a Senator because he was a Senator should be made public. For this reason the committee is recommending that when a Senator receives an invitation to speak and an honorarium is paid, this comes because he is a Senator, and any such income more than \$300 should be made public. But it also decided to recommend to the Senate that all other private financial information should be protected by the procedure of sealed filing and authorized committee examination, which I have already outlined briefly, and which will be explained in greater detail by the chairman.

One member of the committee has expressed his doubts about the wisdom of this decision and is, of course, free to present them to the Senate.

Two other Members of the Senate have indicated today that they expect to offer amendments to this provision and from their past discussion of this problem we can be sure that these amendments will call for complete public disclosure of

all private income and assets of Senators. For myself, I think the committee has found the right solution to the dilemma, though some of the details of its application may be improved upon. I believe such a plan will protect the innocent Senator from unworthy criticism, particularly of a partisan nature, and at the same time, enable the Senate to protect its good name if charges of serious wrongdoing are made against one of its Members. Moreover this approach imposes no restriction on any Member who, for his own reasons, political or otherwise, decides to make a public statement himself of all his assets, debts, and income. This has always been his privilege.

Earlier I pointed out that this "conflict of interest" problem began in the judicial system, then moved into the executive department and is now facing us in Congress. In discussing this problem with various groups around the country, I have learned that many people still believe that this system of divided disclosure is not fair because they believe that men appointed to responsible executive positions are all required to make full public disclosures of all their income and assets.

This myth, and it is a myth, probably grew out of the questioning of Charles Wilson and other Eisenhower Cabinet officers when their nominations were up for confirmation in 1953. People remember this because Wilson was required to dispose of all his General Motors stock. Actually, this was a very special case. The current pattern involving ordinary officials is completely different. Appointees whose nominations require Senate confirmation are usually required to disclose their holdings only to the chairman of the committee having jurisdiction over the confirmation, and this record, in a sealed envelope, is then kept locked in the committee's safe. Even though I am the ranking minority member of a committee that handles many important confirmations, I have never seen any of these financial statements.

The hearing record always shows that one has been submitted, but it is never offered to other committee members for examination. I am sure the same process, with minor variations, is used generally by all committees.

I should also point out that the executive branch system of disclosure does not provide for the public to see such information disclosed by the employee to his superior.

As I close, may I say again briefly that I think the committee has done what it can to make as much "malum prohibitum" law as possible in these four rules. But in the end, the moral tone of the Senate will be a composite of the moral standards of the men the voters of the respective States choose to send to serve in it. Therefore, we cannot hope to write so complete a set of standards as to take away from any Senator his ultimate right and responsibility to make the final moral choices for himself.

But the fact that both the Senate and its creature, this committee, have faced this problem of ethics, and are acting to control it, has in itself, created a new and

stronger moral force inside the Senate against any wrongdoing.

To repeat, and finally, "Codes of ethics bind only the ethical," and when charges are made that one of us has stepped out of line, there must still be the Senate Select Committee on Standards and Conduct or some similar group to act for the Senate in investigating such charges and reporting recommendations to the Senate because, in the end, the Senate itself must carry the ultimate responsibility.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I want to compliment the distinguished Senator from Utah for his fine presentation, along with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. Did the Senator say that he thought no Senate statements of this kind were seen by members of the committee?

Mr. BENNETT. I simply said that, in my case, I have not seen the Senate statements. I am a member of the minority.

Mr. ANDERSON. The members of both sides of the Atomic Energy Committee see the records. I think the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs do, also.

Mr. BENNETT. I would not want to leave the impression that this is never done, but the other thing is not always there.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Utah for his fine statements. I also want to thank him for the splendid contribution he has made, for all the work he has done to prepare the resolution, for getting to the essential foundation points, as well as his contribution in writing the rules himself. His fine experience in many different aspects of this matter has been highly valuable.

Now, Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield within a few minutes; but I want to discuss briefly at this time Rule XLIV: Disclosure of Financial Interest.

Let me say at the beginning that the disclosure rule requires all funds which are semipublic or semipolitical, or which are not personal, to be disclosed to the public in the full reports which we have been discussing.

The wording is tied in with the other proposed rules. It would limit disclosure on matters which are purely private. Even though rule XLIV requires a disclosure, it limits items which are private to a disclosure to the Senate under safeguards and restrictions that we believe properly protect the respect of each Member of the Senate, or the employee involved and, at the same time, gives proper degrees of protection and guidelines to protect the public.

I hope that we will all remember the Senate is an institution of Government that we are dealing with. The U.S. Senate is an institution of the people. It is not a group organized for some purely personal purpose, to make money, or to seek advantage of some kind. The Senate is a public institution, and Senators are public servants. We are not trying to write a police code on similar law. We are writing rules of conduct which have respect for the Senate as an institution, respect for Members and, furthermore,

respect for the people who sent them here.

No one occupies the chairs in this Chamber except those who have been before the electorate of their State in open campaigns. Of course, there may be some who come here to fill a vacancy for a short time. But I think perhaps everyone here, at this time, is an elected public official after having gone through a very refining process, if I may say so—that is the scrutiny of the public, where there is plenty of commonsense, intuition, and judgment involved, under the crossfire of the two-party system, the scramble that competition brings about, and the analyzing processes of logic. Everything is all put up to the public view, and the public makes a choice. So, a man is rather well examined and scrutinized by the electorate before he ever comes to the Senate.

He is watched rather closely after he gets here, and anything he does that may be wrong is soon made known.

Thus, my concept of membership in the Senate is that it is certainly not an institution where a man goes through a campaign for a seat in the Senate, and then the people make their choice and say, "This man shall fill that seat for us for 6 years," but before we let him in the door to take part in any deliberations, we say to him, "No, after all, you cannot sit here. You are not a Member. We will not let you qualify. We will not let you represent those people until you have disclosed everything and accounted for all you have received during your whole life; what you may have known or done; and not only you but your wife and your family." That is just not the American way. I believe that the Senate is a much finer institution than that would indicate. The rule recognizes that. But the rule does provide that anything of a public nature or a semipublic nature, or of a political or a semipolitical nature, does have to be accounted for and publicly disclosed. The rule then protects the private affairs of individual Senators. If a Senator-elect desires to do so, he can disclose all he wishes to before he comes to the Senate or after he gets here.

I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am wondering what the reference in item 4 on page 25 of the report means.

Mr. STENNIS. That is the report?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. It reads:

All papers filed under section 3 of this rule shall be kept by the Secretary of the Senate for not less than three years and shall be made available promptly for public inspection and copying.

Does that mean every record of every kind?

Mr. STENNIS. No, not all records. The reference there is to items that have to be disclosed publicly. It includes funds, we will say, from a testimonial dinner. It includes contributions that might have been made to a Senator for the purpose of defraying the additional expenses of his office. It relates to items of that kind. They are semipublic funds and require full disclosure. Other funds are covered by another rule.

Mr. ANDERSON. The reference is to section (3) of rule XLIV, which reads:

Each Senator, and each officer or employee of the Senate who is compensated at a rate in excess of \$15,000 a year, shall file with the Secretary of the Senate, before the 15th day of May in each year, the following reports of his personal financial interests.

Further on, in paragraph 4, the language reads:

All papers filed under section 3 of this rule shall be kept by the Secretary of the Senate for not less than three years and shall be made available promptly for public inspection and copying.

Mr. STENNIS. That relates in part to the contributions that are referred to on page 4 of the resolution. If the Senator will turn to the resolution itself, page 4, rule XLII provides, under "Contributions":

A Senator may accept a contribution from—

- (a) a fund-raising event organized and held in his behalf;
- (b) an individual or an organization.

So an individual or organization may make contributions to a Senator for his reelection or for defraying the expenses of his office. The resolution provides what the funds may be used for. Also, the Senator must make a report.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not really sure that the resolution so states.

Mr. STENNIS. When all the language is considered together, it will be seen that it is tied closely together.

Another item that must be reported is the amount or value and source of each honorarium of \$300 or more received by a Senator during the preceding year. They would have to be made public because they are rather intimately connected with his title or official duties.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not mind an honorarium being made public, but this language suggests to me that every item is to be published or made available for copying.

Mr. STENNIS. No; only those items that are covered in section 3 of the rule. The other items are those that are filed with the Comptroller General and subject to review by the committee. I was going into that in just a minute. That starts on page 5.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am only trying to get a record and history on it. I seem to read that it should be reported all the way through, but the Senator seems to be saying it does not mean that.

Mr. STENNIS. No; it is tied to the language in the resolution itself.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then, the language on page 25, item 4, is not tied to anything except gifts, honorariums, and so forth?

Mr. STENNIS. Page 25, item 4; that is right. It applies to contributions and honorariums.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Now back to disclosure of financial interests, reading from line 17 on page 5:

Each Senator, and each officer or employee of the Senate who is compensated at a rate in excess of \$15,000 a year, shall file with the Comptroller General of the United States, in a sealed envelope marked "Confidential Personal Financial Disclosure of _____,"

before the 15th day of May in each year, the following reports of his personal financial interests:

(a) a copy of the returns of taxes, declarations, statements, or other documents which he, or he and his spouse jointly, made for the preceding year in compliance with the income tax provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

That is not a public disclosure. It is merely for the purpose of having available, if needed by this committee, a financial income record for that year of the person in question, either the Senator or employee, drawing \$15,000 a year or above.

This is really not any more disclosure, in effect, either to the committee or to the Senate, than the present law provides. We already have authority to examine income tax returns. We have that general authority given to the committee by the executive branch of the Government. If we decide we wish to examine the return of a certain individual, we send the name to the executive department, and, under general authority, it is approved.

This is just the beginning of these personal financial matters. We would have the papers there at the General Accounting Office, but subject to our call. But we could call for the report, under the resolution, only under circumstances as follows: It would require a recorded affirmative vote of 4 of the 6 members of the committee, duly recorded on the minutes, ordering that that file be checked into by the staff or a member.

The rule now is that if it is to be looked into, either a Senator or the regular staff has to do it. Anyway, the information cannot be used or disclosed until that Senator or employee is given notice and given a chance to appear in closed session before the committee. I do not think the word "closed" is in there, but we want to put it in there. It would give the person in question a chance to explain anything that might appear to be inconsistent or that might be irregular. Then, only after that person has a chance to be heard, and bring witnesses that he wished to bring, can the committee use anything that is in the income tax return. So there is really more protection there—if that is what one wants to call it—than there is under the regular law that we are operating under now.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the Senator's yielding. I want to repeat what other Senators have said—I appreciate the enormity of the task of trying to decide what should be included and what should be omitted in this resolution. I think, on the overall resolution, the committee should be congratulated and, of course, the distinguished chairman and the ranking minority member [Mr. BENNETT].

On the section that the Senator is discussing now, I examined it yesterday for the first time. I have two points which are separate, but which I think should be considered by the committee. I have prepared and shall be ready to propose amendments very shortly. The first re-

lates to the first part of the paragraph, that the persons authorized by the committee would, after a recorded majority vote, withdraw the file for examination and audit. I refer to lines 9 to 16 on page 7. It would be presumed by me that, before the committee would vote by a recorded majority vote to withdraw the file from the Comptroller General, there would have to be some reason or cause for the withdrawal. In other words, some showing would have been made to the committee or some charge would have been made that a given Senator had violated this code of ethics, or the general code of ethics, relating to the conduct of a U.S. Senator. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; the Senator is correct in that, as the Senator from Mississippi understands it. The committee would have to have before it information from a source, that was at least believed credible, that there was some circumstance, fact or condition existing that apparently pointed to an irregularity or some question of a wrong in connection with the matter. Under those circumstances, there would have to be a feeling of some substance in the alleged facts before the files would be ordered opened.

Mr. ALLOTT. Knowing the committee, I am sure that is true. That brings me to the second part of it.

The words "examination and audit" cover a very wide scope. The committee could vote, and they could withdraw a file for examination and audit—and I think this part of it is proper—but I ask the Senator if he does not think that it would be entirely proper that, at that time, the Senator himself should be notified.

In other words, the committee would not have taken action unless some kind of a charge had been made to them. Therefore there is, in effect, an issue at that time.

I have drawn three separate amendments, all to the same effect. The amendment that I would propose at that point—and I shall explain it further in a moment—is as follows:

On page 7, line 16, after the period, insert the following: "Immediately after such recorded vote has been taken, the individual concerned, and, in the case of an officer or employee, his supervisor as defined in Rule XLI, shall be informed of the vote to examine and audit, and shall be advised of the nature and scope of such examination."

The reason I would do that is this: We would have a man who, at least by the concurrence of six Senators and a committee staff, had been charged with either an irregularity or wrongdoing. The examination and audit would not necessarily be confined to the papers themselves. They would almost necessarily involve the examination and investigation of outside, extrinsic facts or circumstances.

That, it seems to me, violates the fundamental concept—though I am sure the committee never intended it—of the common law and of our State codes of criminal justice, that a matter of this kind should be at least on paper, pending for a period of 1 month, or 2 months, or even 6 months, before the notice which the Senator does say will be given to him

later is given to him, after the committee receives the papers as evidence.

The use of the words "as evidence" there implies that the issues have then been joined on the charge in some way or manner, and that the committee accepts those papers, including the Senator's income tax report, as evidence in the hearing of the matter.

Then, though I am sure the committee never intended this, the examination and audit could go on for a very long period of time, with a charge having been made against a Senator and his possibly having no knowledge of it at all.

Mr. STENNIS. I respond to that suggestion in this way: If we look into a man's income tax return at all, it is just to make a preliminary search, to see if there are any leads, particularly in the direction of a charge that has been made of irregularities, or something of the sort.

I have had the point raised—and this is with all respect to everyone, of course—that if something wrong is there, if you give notice in advance, the question is raised about destroying evidence that might otherwise not be available somewhere else.

It seems to me that if a preliminary inquiry is to be honest, it ought to have a little better chance to get into the thing and see what the indications are, before giving notice.

The prohibition is clear. The committee cannot proceed to use the material as evidence—and I interpret that word "evidence" as meaning not only testimony in a hearing—but it could not be considered as evidence against the man in any way until he was given notice and an opportunity to explain. But to require the giving of notice before you ever look at the return, I believe, would destroy most of the value of it. That is my impression. I would be glad to look that over a little more. I shall not commit myself at the moment.

Mr. ALLOTT. I know the Senator will give the matter consideration, and I know of his long, distinguished career as a jurist. I never was a judge myself; I was a district attorney at one time.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Along the same line, I would call to the Senator's attention—I do not know how they commence criminal actions in his State, but in my State they can be commenced either by the filing of a criminal complaint, the filing of an information by the district attorney, or by a grand jury.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. But let us assume that the district attorney starts a criminal proceeding against a defendant by means of an information: it is impossible for him to get outside evidence by subpoena until the information has been filed and served.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. In other words, let us suppose that the question involved in the particular case was one of a forged note or a forged check, or something like that. The district attorney probably has the forged instrument in his hands, but he cannot get to the bank records until he has actually created a criminal case, and obtains the records by subpoena.

The situation here is one that concerns me, and I am concerned about it for this additional reason: I am afraid that if the committee—and we respect every one of its members for the work we have done on the matter—should get into a case and actually vote, by a recorded majority vote, to withdraw the files, and had the matter under examination and consideration for awhile, the committee would then be thrown into the position of a star chamber committee.

I think that would be very unfortunate. I just throw these thoughts out, now, and will discuss them with the Senator later.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. But I would hope the Senator would find some considerable merit in them.

My second point—and I shall just state it briefly at this time—is that the resolution makes no provision for the return to the individual concerned of the information filed with the Comptroller General. I think a very short sentence requiring that it be returned either to the Senator or to his legal representative at the end of the time would be completely appropriate.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I think that suggestion is well taken. What I had in mind was to make it 1 year after he left the Senate or his term expired, or something of that sort, that all papers be returned unless their return was expressly waived.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Mississippi, and I hope the Senator will give the first matter I mentioned some consideration.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Colorado. If the Chair will indulge me a moment, I am prepared to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield the floor to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. STENNIS. No, I do not yield.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I did not understand. I thought the Senator from Mississippi had completed his speech.

Mr. STENNIS. No; I have not completed it; but it may be a long time before I do. I have been accepting questions. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut for that purpose now. Does the Senator ask me to yield for a question, or for a speech?

Mr. DODD. No; for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. All right. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question.

Mr. DODD. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I am pleased that we have this resolution before us for consideration. I think it can only be helpful. I wish we had had it a long time ago. I think it is a good thing that we have the proposal now.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. DODD. I want the distinguished Senator from Mississippi to understand that my questions are intended to clarify my own understanding or lack of understanding on some of the phases of the resolution itself.

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield

to the Senator. I know that his questions will be timely, and I will be glad to answer them in the best way that I can.

Mr. DODD. I am sure that the Senator can do that. I do not know where it is best for me to commence. I do not have a long series of questions.

In rule XLII, for example, it seems to me that there are no requirements for the holding or conducting of fundraising events except that a Senator must give his approval.

In the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, would it be desirable to have some requirement such as a disclosure on the invitations to the event of the purpose of the event, or on the ticket or on the program or somewhere? And would it be desirable to require a Senator to spend the proceeds derived from that event only for the specific purpose disclosed on that ticket or invitation or program or whatever it might be?

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly would not rule out a matter like that. It raises a question here of just what purposes would be proper. And it would be difficult to cover that.

We were thinking about letting a Senator pass on the proposition and giving him a chance to pass on the question of whether the purpose is proper and is something of which he approves. If he does not approve of it, that would end it.

Mr. DODD. Would not that declaration or description of the purpose give some meaning to the approval of the Senator? Suppose that my friends were to come to me and say that they want to hold such-and-such an event. If I ask the purpose, how can I be sure that I comply with the proposed rule contained in the pending resolution unless, as I say, the program or ticket or announcement or whatever it might be clearly sets out what I am approving?

Mr. STENNIS. We intended to leave to the Senator involved the matter of placing such conditions or requirements as he might wish on the event. That is why we wanted him in the picture, so that we could not only give him some responsibility, but also some power. And if the Senator had notice of the matter and approved of it, why then to that degree he had joined in it. And without that participation, it would not be a matter that was approved of by the rule.

I think the Senator raises an excellent point there.

Mr. DODD. Perhaps I should spell that out a little more. I find it a little confusing, and I do not mean to be critical of the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. That is perfectly all right. We understand that.

Mr. DODD. The word "contribution" is used in sections 1 and 2 of rule XLII, and the word "gift" is used in section 3.

Should a Senator be permitted to use funds contributed for campaign purposes to defray the reasonable expenses of his office, and funds intended to defray the expenses of his office for campaign purposes?

I may be completely in error on this point, but it seems to me that this would now be permitted under rule XLII as I read it.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator repeat that question?

Mr. DODD. I will try to do so. Would the language of rule XLII permit the use of funds contributed for campaign purposes to defray the reasonable expenses of his office? I think those are the words used in the resolution—"to defray the reasonable expenses of his office." Would a Senator be permitted to use funds collected for campaign purposes to defray the reasonable expenses of his office? And, on the contrary, could he use funds intended to defray the expenses of his office for campaign purposes?

Mr. STENNIS. That is an excellent question. Let me start with the last part of the question first.

Mr. DODD. May I add one thing for the benefit of the Senator. I think that the last part of the situation, as rule XLII now stands, if I read it correctly, would be permitted.

Mr. STENNIS. Rule XLII is designed to cover the first, second, third, fourth, the fifth, and even part of the sixth year in which a Senator is in office, in a time when he does not have what is ordinarily called a campaign fund and when he does not have a treasurer of his campaign fund.

We hit upon the word "contributions" to apply to the entire time. We had these two ways in which the money could be raised or received. And we limited the use of those words. That was a semipublic fund, because it came to the man not because he was an individual, but because he was a public official, a Senator. And we provided how that money could be used.

Suppose that some of that money is left over and is not used for the intended purposes in the years in which we have discussed. Suppose that the Senator's actual campaign has started and he has \$1,000 remaining in the fund: The Senator from Connecticut wants to know if the Senator could pay that money over to the campaign fund.

Mr. DODD. The Senator is correct. I do not press the Senator for an answer now.

Mr. STENNIS. That is all right. The language is very closely written and is highly limited in its content. I think perhaps that under an interpretation of the language as written here, one could not pay it over into a campaign fund. I think that it would be a reasonable disposition to want to make of it, particularly if the campaign were going on. Perhaps the language is a little too tightly drawn.

On a related matter, the matter of a gift, contained in item 3, line 22, page 4, we looked upon the gift as a personal matter.

The word "gift" as we used the word there, or intended to use it at least, means something that is given to a Senator in his individual capacity, something that is his to use as he sees fit if it is a bona fide, good-faith gift.

We did not try to put any real limitations upon it.

We merely provided that if it were more than \$50, it would have to be reported under rule XLIV. However, that could go directly to the Senator's cam-

paign fund. I do not think there is any doubt about that. That is a personal matter. And the Senator can use it. We did not place any limitations on that use.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the questions raised by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut are excellent questions.

I believe the chief thrust of this section is directed toward the public reporting of contributions. Under the existing Corrupt Practices Act, a candidate for the U.S. Senate is not required to report campaign contributions and expenditures of money except from the time he declares under the law as a candidate, and until the last date required by law for his reporting. It is thus a very limited time for which the candidate is required to report contributions received and distributed.

Similarly, there is a defect in the existing Corrupt Practices Act with respect to reporting by political committees. Only a political committee that operates in more than one State is required to report to the Senate. Statewise, it depends upon State laws. Under present law, a candidate might have 15 political committees or more. All could receive political funds and distribute funds. But none is required to report. The rule we are discussing follows very closely the amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act which was adopted unanimously by the Senate, but which has not been acted upon in the House.

As the Senator from Mississippi, Senator STENNIS, has pointed out, the rule requires that a Senator who receives contributions from a fundraising event must take certain steps. He must keep records and report annually to the Secretary of the Senate all political contributions he had received from fundraising events in the previous year.

I would assume that when a Senator becomes a candidate for reelection, the provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act would obtain from that time forward, as to reporting.

I would assume, also, that if a Senator obeying this rule had remaining funds from contributions received throughout a year, he could place such funds in the regular campaign fund always subject to the rule the committee recommends and the provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act.

The rule would apply to other funds which are received by a Member of the Senate by way of gifts, and also funds which are made available to Members of the Senate to operate or, as the resolution reads, "defray the reasonable expenses—of his office." He would be required to report such funds annually and publically to the Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator. His explanation is helpful.

Does the Senator believe it would be helpful if we could draw a sharper distinction? I do not know how. I do not have any words to suggest at this time. I have in mind a sharper distinction between the contributions for campaign purposes and contributions intended to defray the expenses of his office or to

liquidate indebtedness incurred in the course of seeking nomination and election.

Would the Senator from Mississippi agree that we should get this matter defined clearly, so that no one could ever have any doubt about it?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator's first question is: Could funds received from a fundraising event in 1967 or 1968 or 1969 be used to pay off old debts, which were incurred in prior years?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I believe that could be done, if payments and reporting satisfied fully the prohibition of the Corrupt Practices Act—if the payments did not exceed the present totals which are required by the Corrupt Practices Act and if full reporting is done as provided by the act and by this rule.

Earlier today I gave my views on the subject of collecting funds for office accounts. It is my judgment that the proper way to handle this matter would be for the Senate to provide all necessary funds for the operation of an office.

Mr. DODD. I quite agree. I wish that were so.

Mr. STENNIS. May I further answer the Senator?

If the Senator from Connecticut and other Senators would refer back to page 4, rule XLII, lines 20 and 21, they will see the type of language to which I referred a moment ago. However, since then my attention has been called to lines 16 and 17, where it is provided that the Senator may use the contribution to "influence his nomination for election, or his election." We intended that to be a broad matter for any year, and I believe that answers the Senator's question.

Mr. DODD. It is helpful.

Mr. STENNIS. He could use this money, under this language. But, of course, the donor could say, "I want it used for the office expense." If he did say that, then, of course, any Senator would respect the donor's condition.

Mr. DODD. I believe it would be helpful if we could get some colloquy on this question. How far back could a Senator go to defray campaign expenses? Would it be 1 year, 2 years, 3 years, 4 years? It seems to me that it would be helpful to all of us if we knew exactly how far back. Many Members have been in the Senate many years; some of us have been here a much shorter time.

What troubles me is the language involving the word "incurred," which is used in the past tense. Obviously, the committee's resolution refers to expenses incurred prior to the holding of the fundraising function, as I read it. I wonder how we would know how far back we could go with respect to incurred expenses.

Mr. STENNIS. The expenses of a fundraising event, we assume, would be taken out and paid before the sum ever came to a Senator.

Mr. DODD. I am thinking about obligations that go back. How would a Senator know? He has obligations going back, let us say, 3 or 4 years. Is it proper to include these expenses, or is he limited to 1 or 2 years? Precisely what is the limitation? It seems puzzling to me—and

it might appear so to other Senators, unless we have a precise clarification of this rule. How would we know?

Mr. STENNIS. I will have to answer for myself. This rule is written, as I understand it, for prospective application. It would go into effect on a certain date. When it speaks of elections, it refers to elections in the future. Office expense is a broad, general subject.

Mr. DODD. Contemplated expenses.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. Well, the word "contemplated" was used to show that we were not limiting it to bills that accrue on that day. A Senator could plan in advance, let us say, if he thought he needed \$20,000.

Mr. DODD. Consider then the converse of the question I am raising. How far in the future may a Senator contemplate his expenses? May he decide on the day he is sworn in as a Senator that he can plan for his office expenses for the 6 years that lie ahead of him, or 1 year, 2 years, 3 years?

I should like the Senator to understand that I am not trying to badger him. Perhaps it cannot be made more precise.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator has made a very pertinent inquiry. We say "defray the reasonable expenses, incurred or contemplated." That is for the current year. But I am thinking in terms of a year, because this would have to be reported on a yearly basis. Let us say I have spent \$500 of this kind of money. I figure it will take \$1,500 more for this year. I am illustrating now.

So a person could accept a contribution to pay expenses of that kind. Frankly, we were thinking in terms of a campaign deficit. Here, the Senator runs the actual campaign and he comes out \$20,000 behind. It seems to me that paying off that deficit would be a part of the campaign expense and it should be handled as such. It is not an office expense and it is not a matter of getting a nomination in the future. That expense is all in the past. I think we get into a lot of uncertainties there if we try to pick up campaign deficits with that kind of money.

Mr. DODD. I had to return to my office for a meeting, but I did hear the Senator from Colorado ask some questions about the reasonable expense of office.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. DODD. I think that was a helpful colloquy. It is terribly important that we clear it up as well as we can.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. DODD. I believe the Senator will agree that in this great cosmopolitan Nation, the habits, customs, and traditions, whatever one may call them, differ from one State to another. I think my State could be described as a small, cosmopolitan State. Our habits do differ from the habits of those in other States in this country, I expect. It is a good thing. I am not lamenting that; I am approving it.

Mr. STENNIS. I understand.

Mr. DODD. I think it would be helpful to all of us if we understand the matter. For instance, suppose I send flowers for the wedding of the daughter of an old friend who has been helpful to me in politics, who has a big following in my area. Certainly things of that kind would

be considered as a reasonable expense. He is not a close, intimate, personal friend. I do not visit his home and he does not visit my home. He is a valued and good friend to me. Would that expense or could that expense be considered within this language of "reasonable expense"?

Mr. STENNIS. Frankly, I think so. The Senator spoke of flowers.

Mr. DODD. I am using that as an illustration.

Mr. STENNIS. I understand that the Senator is using that example as an illustration. Yes, I think it would be included within limits. What is reasonable would depend on a number of things. We could have an instance of sending thousands of dollars worth of flowers every 12 months.

That would be relatively high but I think an item of that kind goes in with public life and does not detract from the sentiment of it.

Mr. DODD. I am only trying to get an understanding. We should be thinking about this matter.

Would the language of the resolution include expenses in the Senate dining room? Some Senators live relatively close to constituents. Therefore, many of them come down here and it can be embarrassing. I believe some persons think we get all of this free. Is that the kind of thing that should be included? What about travel back and forth to one's State for political meetings and political affairs?

What is bothering me is, how one does know. How does one say, "I guess I cannot buy lunch for these fellows, and if I do, it is not an expense."

I feel, personally, that I should pay my own way after having exhausted the travel allowance.

I am not trying to be critical of the committee. What I am trying to point out in this colloquy is that this is a very difficult area.

Mr. STENNIS. I understand.

Mr. DODD. If I had any answers I would offer them. But I do find it bewildering, and I think it is bewildering to all of us.

What about a telephone bill? Many of us exceed our telephone allowance in a given year. People call us and they want us to return the call. Would that be considered a reasonable expense?

Mr. STENNIS. I think clearly so, with respect to the telephone bill.

This matter varies with respect to meals for constituents. I would think that after a Senator has paid out as much as \$1,200 to \$1,500 of his own money for luncheons in the course of a year for other people, if he has another \$1,000 bill of that kind he could well pay it out of this fund.

I buy lunches for many friends, but I receive a lot of free lunches, especially when I make speeches, and so forth. It even up. I do think the Senator should pay for some of those meals himself.

Mr. DODD. So we are not really able to chisel out any precise ruling. As I understand the Senator, it is a matter of what each one thinks.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I accepted the part about the telephone, anything pertaining to the Senator's affairs, or where

he is going to Connecticut to make a speech; anything such as the telephone bill would be allowable. Unquestionably plane fares are an enormous expense and should be allowed under the rule.

Mr. DODD. I wish to ask one more question and I do not wish to detain the Senator too long.

Mr. STENNIS. I understand.

Mr. DODD. I wish to cite a problem that occurred to me. Let us assume I have a large telephone bill in excess of the money allowed to me; or for travel as we have been talking about.

Would it be proper for a Senator to go to a financial institution and borrow the money to pay the excess telephone bill and the excess travel bill, and pay that loan back out of the proceeds of a fundraising function?

Mr. STENNIS. According to this language if this money is directly used to influence his nomination, his election, or reelection, or expenses incurred in his office, it would come within that language; yes.

The person wanted to pay his bills promptly; he signed a note and paid the bills. I do not know that he could stretch out that obligation over several years. I am not suggesting that the Senator or anyone else would want to do that. However, just because the Senator had already paid for that extra telephone bill I do not think it would exclude him from applying these funds for that purpose. Of course, that would constitute an itemization and a prudent one.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator. I think the responses of the Senator have been helpful to all of us so that we may have a better understanding of what we are trying to do.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the questions have been well put. We recognize the realities of contributions, but we are attempting to set up a rule that will be complied with and kept public, too.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I may have until midnight to file for printing the amendments drafted for presentation tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the Senator is getting his amendments ready. That is a courteous thing for the Senator to do.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding.

I believe the committee and the distinguished chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], are to be commended for their hard and long work. They have accepted a task they did not ask for. It is a most difficult subject and one that on the face of it has many pitfalls. I believe that in the main they have done a very fine job.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I commend the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. We all thank the Senator.

Mr. CURTIS. I think we must all keep in mind that this is a very, very difficult field. I do have a little question about some of the wording, and I would direct the attention of the chairman and the members of the committee to page 4 of the measure.

It says that "a Senator may except a contribution from a fundraising event" upon meeting those conditions and gives his approval. Second, "he receives a complete and accurate accounting of the source, amount, and disposition of the funds raised."

Since he receives that report, obviously it does not refer to making a report by the Senator.

Then section 22 states what he may use that contribution for.

Lines 16 and 17 state that he can use it for campaign purposes and, of course, existing law will require a report. But by lines 18 and 19, he can receive that and say that it is for contemplated expenses of his office.

I cannot find anything in the resolution that will require an accounting at any time for that year, or any subsequent year.

Now I invite attention to lines 12 to 14 on page 4, where it does say that there must be "a complete and accurate accounting of the source, amount, and disposition of the funds received."

That refers to funds of an individual or organization. There can be a fundraising event if we give permission and if we require the people who conduct it to give us an accounting. Then we can receive it for contemplated expenses of the office. It may be there.

But, on the other hand, I refer to page 8, lines 5 to 10 as to the accounting required by rule XLII. Well, rule XLII is just what I read. The accounting is limited there.

I do not want to be in the position of being a nit-picker, but I do think that when we affirm and go on record and say it is all right to raise money for contemplated expenses of running an office—because after all if it is run for the benefit of the public, and it should be paid for by the public—there may be some who would raise some question as to the acceptance by a Senator of contributions for contemplated expenses of running an office. I am not going to press for an answer now. I merely call it to the attention of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. With his usual keen and penetrating analysis, he has brought out at least an uncertainty in the language here. I answer without any hesitation as to page 8, lines 5, 6, and part of 7, that we intended to require an accounting for both of the items on page 4 to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. CURTIS. But it says an accounting required by rule XLII. Rule XLII does not require any accounting for money raised for contemplated expenses to run an office.

Mr. STENNIS. All right. The Senator has made his point. I tell the Senator what we intend to do. Perhaps that language does not quite do it and we might

need an amendment to that language to make it more conclusive.

Mr. CURTIS. Now I should like to ask the intent of the committee on another matter.

Mr. STENNIS. Let me state here that when the attention of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] was diverted on another matter, I said that we intended to cover both of those funds. Perhaps that language falls short. We would be glad to have the Senator prepare an amendment and we will try to make it conclusive on that point.

Mr. CURTIS. Referring to section 1 of the resolution, (a) declares, "a public office is a public trust", (b) declares, "these rules, as the written expression of certain standards of conduct complement the body of unwritten but generally accepted standards that continue to apply to the Senate."

My question is, as regard "continue to apply to the Senate." Does that include officers and employees?

Here is what is at stake. If it does not include officers and employees, then officers and employees are subject only to the things specifically covered in the written rules.

I just raise that and think that perhaps that "continue to apply to the Senate," should apply to Members and officers and employees.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. That would make it clearer; although I have to say that I could not answer the Senator as to just what rules we do have that apply to employees. We have not made a study of that yet, but certainly whatever we have should be continued.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. I agree.

Mr. CURTIS. I would think that is a generally accepted—

Mr. STENNIS. That is a good point—

Mr. CURTIS. Standard, that an employee should not violate the files of his employer.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. Well, that is a good point, too.

Mr. CURTIS. Just as an example, I did not have an opportunity to hear the Senator—I was in the McClellan committee in executive session. It is investigating riots. There is one other thought that occurs to me that is worth considering. The reason I am using the language I have been using is that I have such high regard for this committee and the long hours of work it has put in. I direct the committee's attention to page 7, line 12, which refers to confidential information and everything about a person's property, which probably is a disclosure of the financial operations of the Member's family, by inference, at least. I realize, however, that is not required; but, I mean, it might reveal it, anyway.

It seems to me that the words "persons authorized by" should be deleted from line 12. I think that if we take this step, of requiring Senators to make complete disclosure, and then a Senator or an employee comes under investigation, the receipt of that confidential information should be by a committee itself and not by employees.

There again, I do not want to press

the distinguished chairman for an answer at this time. I throw it out as a suggestion, to those who have spent a great deal more time on it than any of the rest of us in the Senate.

Of course, I do not presume to be right, although I have not made up my mind whether on all of these points I may offer an amendment. I repeat, the committee has been wrestling with this subject, which is a most difficult one, and it is receiving public as well as private advice. We get advice from people who may be denied the source of a good story. I want the committee to know that I am one Senator who, I believe, has some appreciation of the difficult job the committee has undertaken.

Mr. STENNIS. Well, we certainly thank the Senator for his fine suggestions and for his kind and generous words. I think every one of his suggestions is highly deserving. As he has stated, I would not commit myself to them now.

One specific word about striking out the words "shall be made available only to persons authorized by the Select Committee." I think all the members of the committee feel exactly the way the Senator has stated. There is a practical matter, however, involved of the committee members knowing how to interpret various instruments like an income tax return. We must have expert advice on it.

Mr. CURTIS. I am speaking of the initial step of going to the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General is the one who has it?

Mr. STENNIS. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. Of going to him and saying, "Here, let us break the seal on the envelope." I think that responsibility should rest with the committee. I would not think for a minute that from there on the committee would not have to help.

Mr. STENNIS. Very well. I wish the Senator would prepare an amendment carrying out the idea that the breaking of the seal could be only upon request of the committee.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO TOMORROW

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I asked that the Senator yield for the purpose of my making a unanimous-consent request. The Senator knows that I have been waiting in this Chamber for 3 hours and 42 minutes to be recognized to speak on the resolution. I shall support the resolution. I know the Senator from Mississippi has desired to yield to me in the past, but so many questions have been directed to him, and the hour is now so late in the day, that, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Mississippi, instead of speaking for half an hour at this late hour on this Monday evening, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning business tomorrow I may be recognized for half an hour to speak on the resolution.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserv-

ing the right to object—and I shall not object—I would like to have it understood that the Senator will yield to me, if I so desire, for 2 or 3 minutes in the beginning, to point out some matters in connection with the resolution.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Certainly. The Senator from Ohio would be pleased to do so, and for more than those 2 or 3 minutes, if the Senator from Mississippi desired.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 793. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the Alabama Space Science Exhibit Commission;

S. 876. An act relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education; and

S. 2336. An act to determine the respective rights and interests of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation and the Yakima Tribes of Indians of the Yakima Reservation and their constituent tribal groups in and to a judgment fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 454) for the relief of Richard K. Jones.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15399) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. WHITEN, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. BOW, Mr. JONAS, and Mr. LAIRD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

SENATORIAL STANDARDS OF CONDUCT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 266) to provide standards of conduct for Members of the Senate and officers and employees of the Senate.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall continue my discussion of proposed rule XLIV, paragraph (b), on page 6, after I have yielded to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's yielding. I, too, wish to join in commending the committee for an excellent job. I think we probably serve the committee's purpose and the chairman's purpose to raise whatever technical questions we may have today.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; it would be of great help.

Mr. GRIFFIN. And perhaps then the staff will have time, if some amendment needs to be drafted.

Mr. STENNIS. Oh, yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I call attention to rule XLIV, which requires the disclosure of financial interests of each Senator, and each officer or employee of the Senate who is compensated at a rate in excess of \$15,000. This particular rule goes on to list certain things that need to be included in a disclosure report.

I would assume, and perhaps the committee intended, that the same matters of interest would apply to both Senators and employees who received more than \$15,000. But I call attention to subsection (g) on page 7, line 6, which refers to the inclusion of "the source and value of each gift received by him during the preceding year and required to be reported by rule XLII."

It should be noted that rule XLII, on page 4, beginning on line 22, pertains only to gifts received by a Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. So that if an employee of the Senate receiving \$15,000 or more should receive gifts of any amount, under the language on page 7, he would not be required to report it. I assume the intention of the committee was to include gifts made to employees of the Senate. I call that to the committee's attention.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much. It would certainly be my position that it was so intended. I do not think the language really covers it. That was the last language that was prepared and put in, and we overlooked it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. On page 2, line 9, of the resolution, it is stated:

No officer or employee whose salary is paid by the Senate may engage in any business, financial, or professional activity or employment for compensation or gain unless—

(a) the activity or employment is not inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his official duties; and

(b) he has reported in writing the activity or employment to and has received permission from the Member of the Senate or officer of the Senate charged with supervision of the officer or employee. . . .

I am sure we are all aware of what the purpose of that provision is, and it is a very commendable purpose. But I direct the attention of the chairman to the fact that it is rather general and sweeping language. Suppose, for example, that an employee of a Senator desired to have a portion of his salary withheld regularly for the purchase of E bonds, or suppose he were investing in a mutual fund. Obviously, there would be no conflict of interest. Would an employee have to make that fact known to a Senator, and would the Senator have to give his permission before that employee could invest his money in such a way as that? The Senator may wish to consider this problem.

Mr. STENNIS. That is a good question. I am glad the Senator raised it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. That is very good. We have to try to form some rule on that, whether written in here or put in the report in addition, but it certainly is a good point.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am quite conscious of the supplemental views of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], in which he says that appropriations for the necessary expense of the operation of the office of a Senator should be provided by the Senate. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi whether he would consider that travel to the State for purely political purposes during the period of the first 5 years of a Senator's term would be considered an office expense that the taxpayers should pay. Perhaps we should defer the discussion of that question until the Senator from Kentucky returns to the Chamber. Obviously, I do not think that that sort of expense would come within the provision; yet it needs to be taken care of in some way or other.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Michigan has asked some good questions. The Senator from Kentucky had been on the floor of the Senate all afternoon until a few minutes ago. The Senator from Kentucky is consistent about the expenses—the rightful expenses—of a Senator's office. It is hard to get down to the line of division.

To continue with the discussion of the proposed rule XLIV, at the top of page 6, paragraph (b), in setting forth the items that have to be stated in the special report, the requirement also includes "the amount or value and source of each fee or compensation of \$1,000 or more received by him during the preceding year from a client for legal service."

Speaking man to man, there is no more reason why he should have to report that fee than a dentist who might have membership in this body would have to report a dental fee. The reason for making the distinction is that a great deal of the law that is practiced now pertains to governmental matters. I mean matters pertaining to the Federal Government. So much is connected with regulations, so much is connected with the expenditure by the Federal Government of more than \$100 billion a year, that it was thought there ought to be some recognition of those conditions and not deny the lawyer Members the right to practice their profession by trying to regulate the situation.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one brief question?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the Senator would agree, however, that subsection (b) would permit a man to earn as much as \$50,000 or \$75,000, under some circumstances, without reporting a penny of it, if the individual fees were less than \$1,000.

Mr. STENNIS. That is true.

Mr. ALLOTT. Under those circumstances, he could earn \$50,000 without reporting any of it.

Mr. STENNIS. That is true.

Mr. ALLOTT. I simply wanted to make that point clear.

Mr. STENNIS. We were striking at the larger game, if I may use that term.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Proceeding, now, to paragraph (c) on line 6:

(c) the name and address of each business or professional corporation, firm, or enterprise in which he was an officer, director, partner, proprietor, or employee who received compensation during the preceding year; his capacity; and the period of time;

The reason for that is obvious. There is nothing iniquitous about occupying those roles, but it was a disclosure that could well be made, we thought, for guidance in connection with anything that might come up.

(d) the identity of each interest in real or personal property having a value of \$10,000 or more which he owned at any time during the preceding year;

That means just what it says, and no more: Each interest, real or personal—and all property falls into one category or the other—having a value of \$10,000 or more, which he owned at any time during the preceding year.

If I should own Government bonds of the value of \$10,000 or more, I could comply with that provision by just saying, "U.S. Government bonds, \$10,000 or more." That would identify my faith in the Government as well as the fact that I had saved a little money.

As to the question about what value controls, generally it would be the value during the year preceding the one in which the report was made. That is what the language says, "during the preceding year." But one does not have to state the dollar value, under this language:

(e) the identity of each trust or other fiduciary relation in which he held a beneficial interest having a value of \$10,000 or more, and the identity if known of each interest of the trust or other fiduciary relation in real or personal property in which the Senator, officer, or employee held a beneficial interest having a value of \$10,000 or more, at any time during the preceding year.

Then it provides that if he cannot obtain the identity of these fiduciary interests, the Senator or other person shall request the fiduciary to report that information to the Comptroller General.

By the way, I might state here for the record that, as we all know, the Comptroller General is to a degree an arm of the legislative branch of the Government. He is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a 15-year term, and he belongs, in part, to both departments; but he is the nearest thing we have to an officer in the fiscal affairs area. But in any event, the Comptroller General was selected as the custodian in this case; he has no other function under any of these proposals except that of custodian.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. BENNETT. In order to clarify, in section (e) at the bottom of page 6, that language which says: "the identity if known of each interest of the trust or other fiduciary relation in real or personal property in which the Senator, officer, or employee held a beneficial interest having a value of \$10,000 or more, at any time during the preceding year," does the word "which" on line 19 refer to the

Senator's interest in a single asset of the trust, or does it refer to that asset itself?

To be specific, if a trust has an asset worth \$20,000, and the Senator's beneficial interest in the total corpus of the trust is only 10 percent, then the Senator's interest in that asset is only \$2,000.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Would this provision require the disclosure of the asset because the asset itself is worth more than \$10,000?

Mr. STENNIS. No, I think not. What we were trying to get at there was a listing, as nearly as possible, of the different items, just as under section (d)—the different items that appear in this trust in which the beneficial ownership of the item was \$10,000 or more.

It is a little difficult to state that, but that is what we intended.

Mr. BENNETT. I raise the question in order that it might be clear, because I think the language would permit the other interpretation.

Mr. STENNIS. The language may permit it, but there is no doubt about what the committee intended here—that we were trying to obtain the identity of everything in which the Senator or employee had at least a \$10,000 interest of his own.

Mr. BENNETT. We are not interested in the value of the interests of the trust per se; we are interested in the assets of the Senator in any assets in the trust?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. That is the object of the whole thing.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. Proceeding to subsection (f) on page 7:

(f) the identity of each liability of \$5,000 or more owed by him, or by him and his spouse jointly, at any time during the preceding year.

That is the only time that we have brought the spouse into this picture. She comes in then only if she signed a note and there was not any way to keep her out; she just came in incidentally. The committee decided we really did not have any jurisdiction over the spouse as such.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Would the requirement of identity be satisfied simply by listing the person or organization to whom the liability is owed?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; with a statement that the obligation is \$5,000 or more.

Mr. BENNETT. Without its being identified as a note or a mortgage, necessarily?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; I really think it would be more in keeping if the form were identified in some fashion, such as "\$5,000 note," "\$5,000 secured note," or something like that.

Mr. BENNETT. So the Senator would interpret this language to require the identification of the type of liability and the person or organization to whom it was owed?

Mr. STENNIS. I believe that was our general meaning, even though we did not use the word "type." The identity of each liability. I think to identify it properly would include not only the name, but something of the type.

I believe that, in adjusting that language to a general situation, here at the end we overlooked something that we intended to include. The matter of gifts should cover the employees as well as the Senators.

Reading from item 2 of this rule:

All papers filed under section 1 of this rule shall be kept by the Comptroller General for not less than 7 years—

That is a man's term of office plus 1 year. I continue to read:

shall be confidential, and shall be made available only to persons authorized by the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct for examination and audit for any purpose within the jurisdiction of the committee, under a resolution by a recorded majority vote of the full committee on the reports of each individual.

In other words, we just could not give blanket authority. We have to pass on John Jones or Sam Smith in an individual resolution and an individual vote.

I continue to read:

The committee may receive the papers as evidence, after giving to the individual concerned due notice and opportunity for hearing.

We shall offer an amendment at that point to insert the words "in a closed session." The purpose of that amendment is to give the employee or anyone else concerned an opportunity to come in and discuss any apparent irregularities or any apparent or alleged wrongdoing and even produce witnesses in a closed session, if he desires, before the matter has exploded.

I continue to read:

The Comptroller General shall report to the Select Committee on Standards and Conduct not later than the 1st day of June in each year the names of Senators, officers and employees who have filed a report.

(3) Each Senator, and each officer or employee of the Senate who is compensated at a rate in excess of \$15,000 a year, shall file with the Secretary of the Senate, before the 15th day of May in each year, the following reports of his personal financial interests:

(a) the accounting required by Rule XLII for all contributions received by him during the preceding year—

A question was raised there concerning that language. We want to be sure that covers both types of contributions. I continue to read:

except that contributions in the aggregate amount or value of less than \$50 received from any single source during the reporting period may be totaled without further itemization; . . .

That was to avoid having to itemize every little item of \$2, \$4, or \$5, and those items might run into the number of several hundreds or thousands in a large State. Under this proposed rule, such items could be collected and reported without further itemization. However, it would have to be certified.

The next item reads:

The amount or value and source of each honorarium of \$300 or more received by him during the preceding year.

That is the amount or value and the source which, of course, includes the name of the grantor.

Any expense involved in going to de-

liver a speech at an event at which the honorarium was awarded, any expense of travel or other reasonable expense, would not be included in the \$300 and would not have to be accounted for, because it would be reimbursement for funds paid out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. To what line of the resolution is the Senator referring?

Mr. STENNIS. That is lines 11, 12, and 13 of page 8.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, does this refer to campaign contributions?

Mr. STENNIS. It does not. That is just the honorariums. If it does not amount to as much as \$300, it does not have to be reported. In determining that \$300, one does not have to count the expense of travel and other such expense for which he is reimbursed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I continue to read from page 8, line 14:

4. All papers filed under section 3 of this rule shall be kept by the Secretary of the Senate for not less than 3 years, and shall be made available promptly for public inspection and copying.

That refers to the items I have just enumerated, and that means that the Secretary of the Senate would make them available to the press or to anyone else that wants them.

Mr. President, I read from page 8, commencing on line 18:

5. This rule shall take effect on July 1, 1968. No reports filed under section 1 or section 3—

Mr. President, nothing contained in here is retroactive. I said that the other day. I repeat that now for emphasis. We do not propose to make anything retroactive. There is no ex post facto law to be passed under the Constitution. And there is no ex post facto rule to be passed under our recommendation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, with regard to page 8, lines 5 through 9, in which it requires a reporting of all contributions received during the preceding year, does that refer to campaign contributions?

Mr. STENNIS. It does not. That is not primarily campaign contributions. The committee deals with contributions on page 4. Those are public fundraising events like testimonial dinners or things that come along for an individual during the first, second, third, fourth, or fifth year of a Senator's term. And they are not direct campaign funds.

We run into the question of campaign funds when a man becomes a candidate. We thrashed that out pretty well this afternoon, and I think the language ties in rather well.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what I wanted to get straight. It seems to me that we passed a law on campaign funds, and the law should prevail, if for no better reason, because the reporting

of campaign contributions should include both a Senator and his opponent.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. The Senate has passed a new law, and the recommendations here are in keeping with that new law. However, they are tied into the present law which is the only one that we could tie it to. It is tied in the best we could.

Mr. President, I continue reading from page 8, line 18:

5. This rule shall take effect on July 1, 1968. No reports filed under section 1 or section 3 shall include any interest held, payment received, or liability owed before the effective date of the rule, before office or employment was held with the Senate, or during a period of office or employment with the Senate of less than ninety days in a year—

That is intended to cover the situation in which a Senator comes here on a new appointment and only serves for 30, 60, or 90 days. There is no use in requiring such a man to comply with this.

I continue reading from page 9, line 1: except that the Senator, or officer or employee of the Senate, may file a copy of the return of taxes for the year 1968, or a report of substantially equivalent information for only the effective part of the year 1968.

We can comply with the income tax requirement, in other words, by filing a report for all of 1968. However, if one chooses to do so, he can file substantially equivalent information for the last 6 months of 1968.

There is something that I want to call to the attention of the Senate and also the members of the committee. I think that some additional provisions ought to be made here.

After the 7-year period has elapsed, after these confidential papers have been filed, together with a copy of the income tax return, I think we ought to have an additional provision to require that a Senator can ask for those papers when he leaves and, after the lapse of a year, get them at that time, or his executors or personal representatives can request them after a year and obtain them.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, why put another year in there? Why not make them available at the end of 7 years?

Mr. STENNIS. I just thought we ought to keep them for awhile. They might have relevancy to something pending—not as to that Senator, but to someone else.

Mr. BENNETT. Would that not in effect be saying that they would keep them for 8 years and then give them back?

Mr. STENNIS. No. It is required that they keep them for 7 years.

Mr. BENNETT. If we say that they keep them for another year before a man can get his papers back, we are changing the seven to an eight.

Mr. STENNIS. We would have to figure that out. I think if a man serves 3 years and leaves the Senate, he ought to be able to get all of his papers back after another year has expired. We should give him or his representatives at that time a chance to regain those

papers. If they are not claimed within a certain time, they will then be destroyed.

I also want to make mention here, referring to page 7, line 18, that the hearing concerning the income tax and other matters would be a closed hearing.

I mention that for the information of all Senators. It is something that just came to my mind.

Mr. BENNETT. I believe that tomorrow the committee will have an amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] to tighten up the length of time or to set specifically the point in time at which the man whose envelope may be opened must be notified.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. We talked about that this afternoon.

I did not want the committee's hands tied to the extent that it could not even make a preliminary investigation and perhaps cause the destruction of evidence.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps, Mr. President, between now and the time the Senate meets tomorrow, we may be able to work this out in consultation with Senator ALLOTT.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate that. So that we will have something to go on, I will offer an amendment, so that it can be printed and available.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to add this point: This matter now belongs to the Senate and the Senators. It is no longer a committee matter. We have brought forth the resolution for inspection, addition, subtraction, and consideration. Everyone has an interest, and we are not trying to ward off anything. We are going to protect fundamentals as best we can.

Mr. President, if there are no other questions, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, if the discussion on the pending matter is concluded for the afternoon, I send to the desk four amendments, and I ask that they be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The amendments, numbers 618 through 621, will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

THE GOLD SITUATION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, last Thursday afternoon, March 14, the Senate, by a vote of 39 to 37, removed the gold cover from the currency of the United States.

This morning I note a headline in the newspaper, "Gold Pool Dropped To End Speculation." This is from the newspaper of March 18, 1968. Under that, in headlines, "Two Prices Adopted by Seven Nations." It reads:

The United States and six cooperating nations yesterday abandoned the gold pool they had been operating for the past six and one-half years and said they would no longer "buy gold from the market."

In essence the plan, announced at the conclusion of a historic two-day session at the Federal Reserve Board here, is designed to end the speculative drain on official gold reserves.

It means that there will be a two-price gold system—\$35 an ounce for official international transactions, and whatever price develops in an outside "unofficial" market.

Further on in the same article:

In a word, the cooperating central banks are going out of the gold buying and selling business—except among themselves.

That means:

Central banks will no longer buy newly-mined gold from South Africa or any other producer.

The U.S. Treasury will no longer license, effective today, the sale of gold from its stock to industrial users in this country, who last year tapped Treasury monetary gold for \$158 million.

At another point in the same article:

The cooperating nations are basing their actions on the belief that the future needs of the international monetary system will come from the growth of "paper gold" rather than the real metal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the most interesting and most gratifying aspect of the situation to me is that in 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963 I proposed legislation, and introduced it in the Senate, to do exactly what these seven "brilliant" nations have finally done in this year of our Lord 1968, 9 years after the bill was first introduced in the Senate.

I do not have a copy of my earliest bill with me, but I do have some remarks that I made in 1966, and I should like to read briefly from those:

On August 9, 1965, a meeting was arranged by Senator Gruening, and it was attended by Under Secretaries Barr and Deming. During that meeting both gentlemen expressed disapproval of either a subsidized or a two-priced system, stating that in their opinions either proposal would cause greater conversion to gold by foreign holders of dollars in the belief that the price of gold was about to increase. However, this does not explain the massive conversion that has been going on since 1961. Apparently, quite a few prefer gold to dollars now. It is my hope that these hearings will shed some light on why gold is preferred to dollars, and by whom.

Also, at that meeting, Secretaries Barr and Deming expressed the belief that only two legislative avenues to increase gold production are open. One was to increase the depletion allowance and liberalize depreciation for income tax purposes. The other was to launch a massive effort to improve methods of discovery and refining.

I might say at this point, parenthetically, that the first of these, the attack upon this by the increasing of the depletion allowance and the liberalizing of depreciation for income tax purposes, was very quickly abandoned by the Treasury Department:

It was suggested that Treasury draft a proposed change to the Internal Revenue Code that would create a more favorable tax climate for the gold miner.

Parenthetically, again, that was never done.

However, to my knowledge nothing has been submitted. With regard to the launching of a massive effort to improve methods of discovery and refining, there are two basic defects with this suggestion: First, it would take years to complete such research, and assuming that the research was successful, it would take several more years before its results would produce any appreciable in-

crease in production. We do not have years to wait.

Second, it would require a large investment, and generally speaking, the gold industry is not in any position to finance it.

So, we find ourselves in this position: the proposals that have been made that might have an early effect in increasing gold production are violently opposed by the Treasury Department; and the proposals that are ostensibly acceptable to Treasury are unrealistic or Treasury does not seem prone to act. Inertia has been the one overriding element in the gold situation.

Most of the gold mining districts are depressed areas with substantial and consistent unemployment. We have a Poverty Program and a whole myriad of other programs to create jobs, but we have nothing for the gold miner. He is forgotten even though the product he could produce is of such great importance to our monetary system.

There are those who have suggested that we remove the gold backing from our currency—

This was said over 2 years ago—in the mistaken belief that it would have little effect upon our economy and the "stability of the dollar". I disagree with that thesis completely. But, judging by what has happened in the past year, namely, the debasing of our coinage and the removal of the gold cover from Federal Reserve deposits, it would appear that that is the direction in which we are headed. If, as has been indicated by Treasury officials, the mere discussion of the gold situation has an unsettling effect upon foreign dollar holders, what would happen to the "stability" of the dollar if we removed the gold cover? I can assure you that I will never vote to remove the gold cover from our currency. In my opinion, such action would lead to financial chaos in this country.

Mr. President, I have before me excerpts from a speech given on May 4, 1966. I think it is appropriate to repeat again that I did not vote to remove the gold cover from the currency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to the Honorable A. Willis Robertson, who was formerly the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is dated August 2, 1963.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C.

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for the views of this Department on S. 158, a bill "To prohibit sales of gold by the Government for commercial use or for the arts, or for the purpose of lessening the price and value of gold."

S. 158 would monetize all gold holdings and purchases by the U.S. Government by prohibiting the Federal Government from selling gold for non-monetary uses. The sale, the price, and the granting of a license to import gold for non-monetary uses are now within the Executive discretion of the President. Purchases and sales of gold in the United States, including imports and exports, are subject to the "Gold Regulations," administered by the U.S. Treasury Department and authorized by the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 (31 U.S.C., Sec. 442). At present, the United States stands ready not only to buy domestically mined gold for \$35 an ounce,

but also to sell for \$35 to licensed purchasers for "commercial use or for the arts".

The Department of Commerce recommends that the bill not be enacted.

The apparent purpose of the bill is to raise the price of gold for non-monetary uses within the country, without discarding the \$35 per ounce monetary price. Since the demand for industrial gold is greater than the amount produced from mines in the United States, the elimination of U.S. Government sales of gold for this purpose might appear to lead to a rise in the price. This, however, would depend on two other conditions, neither of which appears to be barred by S. 158: (1) that the United States would discontinue the purchase and sale of gold to maintain the international price of gold at \$35 an ounce; or (2) that the United States would no longer exercise its discretionary power of authorizing imports of gold for industrial uses. So long as both of these practices continue to be honored, the United States in reality, though indirectly, would still be maintaining the \$35 price for industrial gold in the United States. The effect of S. 158 would then be academic.

The passage of a bill obviously intended to raise the price of industrial gold in the United States, whether or not the bill would accomplish this purpose, may be construed by other countries as a step toward devaluation by the United States.

It is only necessary for such speculation to occur in order for a flight from the dollar to start; and once started, the flight may feed on itself. Confidence in the gold value of the dollar among foreign governments and central banks has been tied to the stability and fixity of the price at \$35. Today this relationship is considered to be a foundation stone of Free World economics. S. 158, however, introduces uncertainties regarding this relationship which can affect injuriously the United States and Free World monetary position.

The use of gold in industry and in the arts in the United States has doubled in recent years. These sales do not draw down the United States monetary gold stock unduly. The importance of gold as a strategic material continues to grow, particularly in the space area. For example, gold foil is used in the electronic assembly for the "Telstar", the first privately owned satellite, and steering

jets for space vehicles are plated with gold to reflect 95% of all radiation to which an orbiting vehicle's surface is exposed. Vaporized gold is deposited on surfaces of small jet controllers used in instrumentation and circuitry as protection against friction and corrosion. New industrial applications for gold are being developed, including greater use of gold in electronic devices, and in other electronic applications.

Gold continues to be used in dental alloys, in scientific, chemical, and other equipment, and in the arts (jewelry, watches, and decorative articles). The precious-metal jewelry industry in the United States, employing over 25,000 workers and producing goods valued at nearly a half billion dollars annually, uses substantial quantities of gold in the production of what is classified as solid gold jewelry, gold filled and rolled jewelry, and costume jewelry. Recent data on the production, use, import, and export of gold is attached to this report.

Domestic production of gold, at present, supplies only about a half of the commercial requirements, the other half being obtained from the Government. If the Government were to be prohibited from making such sales, manufacturers would be deprived of this supply for their material requirements, and the cost to them of their remaining supply may be sharply increased, with serious injury to the industry, as well as unemployment in certain areas.

The beneficiaries of a rise in the price of gold would be: (1) the relatively small number of United States gold miners who have been on notice for many years that the price is fixed at \$35; (2) foreign producers, foreign governmental holders, and hoarders of gold; and (3) in a political class by itself, the Soviet Union, which is one of the three major world producers of gold. It is difficult to justify the profits that may accrue to these beneficiaries of S. 158, in the face of the possible dislocations and threats to the United States and Free World monetary systems and economic well being that may result.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely,

LAWRENCE JAMES,
(for Robert E. Giles).

(In thousands of fine troy ounces)

| | 1957 | 1958 | 1959 | 1960 | 1961 | 1962 |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| Gold issued for use in industry and the arts in the United States: | | | | | | |
| Government-stamped bars issued by the U.S. Mint..... | 604 | 771 | 2,354 | 2,172 | 2,204 | (1) |
| Bullion in various forms issued by private refiners and dealers..... | 1,638 | 1,831 | 821 | 1,528 | 1,708 | (1) |
| Total..... | 2,242 | 2,602 | 3,175 | 3,700 | 3,912 | (1) |
| Secondary materials returned to monetary use and to private refiners and dealers..... | 792 | 769 | 653 | 700 | 1,137 | (1) |
| Net quantity issued..... | 1,450 | 1,833 | 2,522 | 3,000 | 2,775 | (1) |
| U.S. mine production..... | 1,794 | 1,739 | 1,603 | 1,667 | 1,548 | 1,527 |
| U.S. imports..... | 7,701 | 8,120 | 8,485 | 9,322 | 1,615 | 11,842 |
| U.S. exports..... | 4,806 | 886 | 50 | 47 | 22,146 | 29,596 |

¹ Not available.

² January–November 1962.

Source: U.S. Treasury Department; U.S. Bureau of Mines; U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I shall quote from one paragraph of this letter which shows exactly how nearsighted our Government and this administration have been in trying to deal with the gold problem:

It is only necessary for such speculation to occur in order for a flight from the dollar to start; and once started, the flight may feed on itself. Confidence in the gold value of the dollar among foreign governments and central banks has been tied to the sta-

bility and fixity of the price at \$35. Today this relationship is considered to be a foundation stone of Free World economics. S. 158, however, introduces uncertainties regarding this relationship which can affect injuriously the United States and Free World monetary position.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 158, which I introduced in 1963, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the bill (S.

158) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all gold held or bought by the United States Treasury, or mints, or assay offices, or by the Federal Reserve banks, shall be construed to be monetary gold. Such gold shall not hereafter be sold for commercial use or for the arts, and no gold shall hereafter be sold by the Treasury, or by the Federal Reserve banks, or for the account of the Treasury or of such banks, directly or indirectly, in the United States, its territories or possessions, for the purpose of depressing the market in gold or lessening the price and value of gold.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it will be noted that the wording in S. 158 is the same as the wording in S. 3385, which I introduced in 1962.

In conclusion I wish to point out that Treasury Department officials consistently opposed my legislation on the theory that it would effect the stability of the dollar. This is shown by the letter to former Senator Robertson who was chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By the action of yesterday it would appear that Treasury officials fear there is an unsettling effect in establishing two prices when the dollar is not under pressure. I said they were wrong and I have been saying it for 9 years. The action of the seven nations setting up a two-price system has proved I was right. If we had taken steps 9 years ago, 8 years ago, 7 years ago, or 5 years ago to adopt the legislation which I offered, it is well possible we would not have been faced with the shameful situation—and it is a shameful situation—in the international arena of being forced to withdraw the gold from behind our currency. We did the same thing in 1965 by withdrawing the gold from our Federal Reserve deposits.

Mr. President, I say they were wrong then and they are wrong now. The time to have established the two-price system was when the dollar was not under attack. It could have been carried out then with a minimum of dislocation. Now we can only hope.

This is another example of why Congress should not be so quick to relinquish all constitutional powers over our money. Congress should review our monetary posture and commence writing guidelines and limitations on our money, in my judgment.

If anything was proved by the last few years, it has been proved that this Government, the Treasury, the Federal Reserve Board, the economic advisers and college economists who told us what to do were wrong. What they told us did not stop the gold drain in this country. Today we are facing even a more serious situation because in 1963, for example, the demand upon our gold production by the arts and industries was only double the amount of our local domestic production of gold. Today that demand has grown to the extent that it would take four times our domestic production, so that demand on our local production for arts and industries is 100 percent greater than it was 5 years ago.

It is very easy to speak in retrospect,

but when I consider the short shrift that the bills that I have introduced in the past few years on gold received—and not only bills that I introduced but those of other Senators vitally interested in this great industry who know we have a wealth of gold in this country at our command if we only open our minds and imagination and get our heads out of ruts. It is obvious that we have enough gold to take care of this country. It cannot be processed now, in a month or two, but with a farsighted program we can do it and we will. Those of us who are interested in the gold industry are willing to prove that it can be done.

EXHIBIT 1

GOLD POOL DROPPED TO END SPECULATION— TWO PRICES ADOPTED BY SEVEN NATIONS (By Hobart Rowen)

The United States and six cooperating nations yesterday abandoned the gold pool they had been operating for the past six and one-half years and said they would no longer "buy gold from the market."

In essence the plan, announced at the conclusion of a historic two-day session at the Federal Reserve Board here, is designed to end the speculative drain on official gold reserves.

It means that there will be a two-price gold system—\$35 an ounce for official international transactions, and whatever price develops in an outside "unofficial" market.

PREVENTING RESALES

And to prevent any governments or central banks from buying gold at \$35 an ounce to resell in the private market at a profit, the cooperating nations said that "henceforth they will not sell gold to monetary authorities to replace gold sold in private markets."

France, for example, will not be allowed to turn in dollars for gold at \$35 an ounce if she turns around and sells that gold privately.

Initial reaction from businessmen and bankers here and abroad was generally favorable. Most observed that it should provide time in which the United States could bring its balance of payments under better control.

The dramatic moves, announced by Federal Reserve Chairman William McC. Martin, were the answer of the seven nations to last week's crisis buying of gold through the pool in London.

LOST \$1.5 BILLION

Since devaluation of the British pound last November, the seven nations lost about \$1.5 billion in gold to speculators, a drain that they decided could not go on.

When originally established in November, 1961, the gold pool was intended to diminish the fluctuations in the price of gold by offering small amounts to speculative buyers. It worked well until last year, when the decline in U.S. gold stocks and lack of confidence in the dollar stepped up the pace of the buying.

Officials said that the London market for gold—as distinguished from the pool—would stay closed for the next two weeks. That is, there will be no "free" market in gold in London during that period.

The assigned reason was to provide a cooling off period. But other "free" or unofficial markets, such as the one in Paris, are unaffected.

At the same time, the governors of the central banks attending the Washington meeting announced that they would provide new lines of credit to the British, bringing the total available up to \$4 billion. Included will be \$500 million in a new "swap" arrangement by the Federal Reserve, part of an over-all \$2.275 billion boost in those standby credit arrangements.

If the seven governments can make the

new gold arrangements work, the monetary supply of gold will be "frozen" at the \$41 billion plus now in the system. This is "sufficient," they said, in view of the prospective addition of a new paper asset, the Special Drawing Rights.

The essence of the plan was devised by Italian central banker Guido Carli, who attended the Washington meeting.

In a word, the cooperating central banks are going out of the gold buying and selling business—except among themselves.

That means:

Central banks will no longer buy newly-mined gold from South Africa or any other producer.

The U.S. Treasury will no longer license, effective today, the sale of gold from its stock to industrial users in this country, who last year tapped Treasury monetary gold for \$158 million. They will be able to buy from U.S. mining sources, or on foreign free markets. And the Treasury said it would allow American gold producers to sell as well to foreign buyers.

The cooperating nations are basing their actions on the belief that the future needs of the international monetary system will come from the growth of "paper gold" rather than the real metal.

Officials indicated their belief that the decision to keep the official price at \$35 an ounce, and to insulate the existing monetary stock, would deflate the speculative rush.

It is obvious however, that a two-priced gold system itself does not solve the U.S. balance of payments problem, nor guarantee that U.S. gold stocks won't be tapped by some central banks.

For example, some smaller central banks, if nervous may accelerate the rate at which they have been exchanging dollars for gold. The United States will sell gold at \$35 an ounce—provided they don't resell any to private markets.

Yesterday's decision amounts to a partial demonetization of gold, in this way: supplies of newly-mined gold and holdings of speculators' and hoarders' gold will no longer have a value as a form of money. They will continue to have a value, perhaps even higher than \$35 an ounce, as a commodity, like copper or jute.

Officials insisted that the new two-priced system for gold would have no effect on the value of the dollar, particularly in the United States, where gold is not part of everyday currency.

Another big question mark concerns the French. No one expects France to buy gold from the U.S. for speculative resale. But the French could help stimulate a drain on U.S. gold supplies through other nations.

The other question relating to France will be its willingness to speed along the activation of the Special Drawing Rights system. The French have been trying to persuade their European Common Market partners to surround the SDRs with various limitations.

But a special statement last night by the International Monetary Fund said that the SDR system was on track.

One reason for the new aid package to Britain relates directly to the gold speculation of recent weeks. As anxieties mounted, many who held deposits in sterling changed them into dollars, with which they bought gold through the London pool. The new lines of credit are designed to help restore sterling balances.

The communique noted "the determined policy" of the U.S. Government "to defend the value of the dollar through appropriate fiscal and monetary measures and that substantial improvement of the U.S. balance of payments is a high priority objective."

No specific deals were made or offered by the United States in support of this commitment, but President Johnson's Saturday statement offering to cut expenditures more

deeply in exchange for a tax increase was noted by the participants of the meeting.

And the suggestion from a top Administration source that any increase in Vietnam troop strength would be "moderate" was the kind of thing the foreign central bankers had been hoping to hear.

Note was also taken of the fact, the communicate said, that Congress had freed all of the \$11.5 billion U.S. gold reserves "for defending the value of the dollar."

One key point of the communicate, though it sounded technical, is of major importance: the governors agreed to "cooperate even more closely than in the past to minimize the flow of funds contributing to instability in the exchange markets."

This was directed to this circumstance: As worries about the dollar mounted in the past several weeks, there was a sharp increase in money moving into Germany, because the Deutschmark is considered a strong currency.

Much of this came from the "Euro-dollar" market. "Euro-dollars" are dollars owned by foreigners, and held on deposit in banks. The intent of the closer cooperation mentioned is to facilitate the swapping of currencies, as confidence in the dollar is restored.

The final line of the communicate said that cooperation of other central banks is invited. This direct bid to the French was underscored in a comment by Bank of England Governor Sir Leslie O'Brien who said that the seven nations "are not anxious to widen the gap between France and the rest of us."

Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, managing director of the International Monetary Fund, said in a statement last night:

"It is most important that the monetary authorities of all member countries should continue to conduct gold transactions consistently with this undertaking and they should cooperate fully to conserve the stock of monetary gold."

"In the longer run it will not be sufficient simply to conserve global reserves. In this connection, it is to be noted that work on the establishment of the Special Drawing Rights facility in the fund is proceeding on schedule. It is to be hoped that this facility will enter into force with the least possible delay . . ."

EXCISE TAX RATES—AMENDMENTS NOS. 626, 627, AND 628

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk three amendments to H.R. 15414 and ask that they be printed and held at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if no other Senator desires to speak at this time, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 19, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 18, 1968:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps as indicated, subject to the qualifications therefore as required by law:

LINE

Abbott, Peter D.
Abercrombie, Gordon E.
Ackley, Frederick R., Jr.
*Adams, Kenneth W.
Adams, Lloyd H.
*Albert, Virgil E.
Albrecht, Carl J.
Alden, Michael G.
Alexander, Edward E., Jr.
*Alexander
Corington A., Jr.
*Allgood, Dempsey E.
*Alvarado, Philip D.
Amidon, David M.
*Anckonle, Alex, III
*Anderson, Bryan R.
Anderson, Donald R.
*Andres, Charles G.
*Armbruster, William A.
Arnold, James J., Jr.
Arnold, Robert C.
Art, Raymond J.
Asafaylo, Richard J.
Ascher, David C.
*Ashley, Wallace T.
*Askey, Henry B.
Austin, David V.
Austin, Jack B.
*Baggett, Marvin L.
*Bailey, Fred W.
*Baker, Harry L., Jr.
*Baker, Henry T.
Baker, Robert E., Jr.
*Baldwin, John S.
*Ball, Hugh E., Jr.
*Ball, Ronald F.
Ball, Stuart F.
Banman, Robert E.
Barnum, Gary L.
*Bash, John F.
*Bass, Terrence D.
*Bateman, Everett P.
*Bates, Wilmer I.
Battaglia, Carmen C.
Battaglini, Arnold R.
Battenburg, John A.
*Batts, William H., Jr.
*Beachy, Lloyd H.
Beasley, Robert H., Jr.
Beaton, Robert R.
*Beaube, James D.
*Beck, Victor
Bednarek, Norbert H.
*Been, John T., II
Beggs, Richard K.
*Behning, William P.
*Bell, Arthur G.
Bell, Joe L.
*Belson, Douglas A.
*Benham, Jack O.
*Bennett, David M.
*Bennett, Maurice H., Jr.
*Benton, Chestley M.
Bessire, Robert P.
*Bethel, Lewis E.
*Betts, Stanton W.
Biddle, Maxwell D., Jr.
*Bishop, David K.
*Bishop, John W.
*Bishop, Robert P.
Black, Donald L.
Black, Robert S.
*Blackler, Harvey R.
*Blackwelder, Billy G.
*Blake, Donald T.
*Blanch, Robert F.
*Blasch, Lynn P.
Blass, Richard G.
*Bleynat, Edward L.
Bloch, Vernon C.
Blöse, Larry E.
*Boatright, Keith A.
*Bock, Karl F.
*Boehm, Roy H.
Boisenin, William C.
*Boland, Joseph E., Jr.
*Bolling, Charles E.
Bond, Thomas H.
Borde, Paul P.
*Borgquist, Bruce W.
Boshoven, Robert L.
*Botkin, Harry L.
Bowers, John M., Jr.
Boyd, David H.
Boyle, Alonzo R.
*Boynton, Thomas F.
Bozzo, Peter R.
*Bradshaw, Joe L.
Brainerd, George E.
Brake, Robert L.
Branch, Daniel B., Jr.
*Branch, Nathan E.
*Branchflower, Norman H., Jr.
*Brandt, Robert T.
*Breitenbach, Robert G.
*Brett, Thomas R.
*Briggs, Roger C.
Brons, John C.
*Brooks, Linton F.
*Brooks, Thomas A.
*Brown, Alan R.
*Brown, Dale S., Jr.
Brown, Larry J.
Brown, Michael J.
*Brown, Ronald L.
*Brownlie, Robert C., Jr.
Bruce, Malvin D.
*Brumwell, Robert K.
*Buchberger, Harold F.
Bundarin, John P., Jr.
Burchett, Jerome V.
*Burke, Nolan R.
*Burns, Charles E.
*Burns, Gerald J.
*Burns, John J.
Burns, John M., Jr.
Burns, Thomas M., Jr.
*Burridge, George D.
*Burrows, Robert G.
*Buss, Richard H.
*Busse, Arnold L.
*Butterfield, John A.
Byng, Robert H.
Cadow, William S., Jr.
*Caggiano, Robert R.
*Calder, Donald J.
*Caldwell, James A.
Calhoun, Theodore H.
*Callan, James R.
Camilleri, Terrence J.
*Capps, James B.
*Carlson, Gilman R., Jr.
*Carlson, William C.
*Carpenter, John E.
Carpenter, Stephen P.
*Carrico, William C.
*Carroll, Robert D.
Carson, Richard L.
*Carter, Burnett W.
Carter, Clyde A. L.
*Carter, Frederick W., Jr.
*Carter, George W.
Cartwright, James P.
Carwin, James P.
*Casciato, Anthony C.
*Case, Arnold J.
Castro, Alexander, Jr.
*Catalano, Alvin N., II
*Catalano, Peter R.
*Cauvet, Kenneth B.
*Cawse, Arthur C.
Ceres, Robert L.
Chabot, Peter G.
*Chambers, Leroy
*Chandler, David F.
*Chandler, Ralph W.
Chandler, Thomas R.
Cheston, Daniel M., IV

*Chider, Thomas J.
Chidsey, John W.
*Chop, Raymond E.
Christensen, Keith L.
Christian, Richard A.
Ciboci, John W.
Clapper, Gean P.
*Clarity, Michael G.
*Clark, Franklin W.
Clark, Jackson S.
Clark, Kent R.
Clark, Maurice E.
Claudice, William G.
*Clegg, William L.
*Clement, Russell L.
Clements, Wilton R.
*Clendenon, William D.
Cliff, Thomas A.
*Cline, Calvin J.
Coates, Dannie R.
*Coats, Roger M.
*Coffman, Rodney E.
Colbert, Edward W., Jr.
*Coldwell, Thomas
Cole, Gerald L.
*Cole, Lawrence E.
Colley, Michael C.
*Collins, Gayle V.
*Collins, James E.
*Collins, John F.
*Collins, Richard R.
*Collis, Charles D.
Commons, Patrick M.
*Coneys, Joseph E.
Conley, Thomas H., Jr.
*Connell, Raymond P.
*Connerton, James E., Jr.
Connolly, Raymond T.
*Converse, Joseph I., Jr.
*Cook, Elmer J.
*Coon, Morris E.
Cooper, Michael E.
Corey, James W., Jr.
Corlett, Norman J., Jr.
Cormack, James P.
*Cornelius, Patrick B.
Corse, Carl D., Jr.
Cortesini, Edward P.
Cossey, James D.
Costello, William G.
*Cotton, William R.
*Courtney, Carl M.
Courtney, Wallace C.
*Coward, Elwood A.
*Cox, Kenneth H.
*Craft, Charles D.
*Craft, Don C.
Crandall, Joel L., Jr.
*Crawford, Arthur G.
*Creager, Leslie F.
*Cross, Creighton L.
*Crowninshield, George W.
Crumpacker, John P.
*Cuddy, John V.
*Cunneen, William J., Jr.
Curtin, James M.
*Curtis, Charles D.
Curtis, Guy H., III
Cutler, Lee, M.
Dachos, John
*Dafce, James L.
Dall, Hubert L.
*Damato, Joseph J.
Davis, Francis J.
*Davis, Joseph F.
Davis, Walter J., Jr.
*Dawson, James F.
*Deangelo, Lawrence F.
*Delaney, Billie L.
*Delpercio, Michael, Jr.
*Demarke, Joseph, III
*Dennis, Everett J.
Depaul, Anthony W., Jr.
*Derryberry, William D.
*Desmond, Michael J.
Despard, Ronald A.
*Devoy, William M.
*Dews, Harry P., Jr.
*Dietz, Donald L.
Dirvianskis, Arunas
*Disney, Donald G.
*Dobbins, James R.
*Dodge, Peter B.
*Donis, John N.
*Donnellan, Robert I.
*Donodeo, Roger F.
Donovan, David A.
*Dorsey, Edward B.
*Dougerty, "J" Alvin
Dougherty, Thomas F., Jr.
Doyle, Ronald J.
*Doyle, William J.
*Drake, James
Drake, William B., Jr.
*Dressler, Joseph A.
*Driver, Ace C., Jr.
*Driver, Thomas P.
*Drude, Leonard J.
*Duggan, Charles E., Jr.
*Dunlap, Harry A., Jr.
Dunlop, James M.
Dunn, James V.
*Durham, James L.
*Dykeman, Charles J.
*Dykes, James E. J.
Dziedzic, Walter T., Jr.
*Eastman, David R.
Eaton, Donald R.
Edgerton, Everett W., Jr.
*Edwards, Robert L.
*Efron, Herbert M.
Egan, Gerald E.
*Egan, Joseph R.
*Eggleston, John R.
*Eglin, James M.
Ehlers, Ernest J.
*Elandt, Daniel A.
*Elison, Augustus T., Jr.
Elliott, George M.
*Elliott, William L.
Ellis, Gary H.
*Ellison, Paul E.
Engel, Richard L.
*Epley, James M.
*Ericson, Robert E.
Estes, Clifford D.
Estes, John A.
*Evans, George F.
*Evans, John A.
Evans, Lucian C.
*Evans, Ronald A.
Evans, Thomas W.
Everette, Oliver G.
Eyer, Lee W.
*Fairly, James P., Jr.
Featherstone, James F.
*Fees, Howard J., Jr.
*Feldhaus, John A.
*Ferguson, Robert H.
Fernow, William F.
*Fetzer, Carl F.
Field, Tyler I.
Finerty, Martin J., Jr.
Finlen, James R.
Fischer, George J.
*Fisher, Martin R.
Fitzgerald, Michael E.
*Fitzgerald, Thomas A., Jr.
*Fitzpatrick, Donald J.
*Fitzpatrick, Eugene E.
*Flanagan, George T.
*Flannery, William F.
*Fleming, James J.
*Fleming, Robert E.
Flikeid, Jack R.
Flynn, Gerrish, C.

- Flynn, Noel S.
 *Foote, Maynard D.
 Forbes, Raymond L., Jr.
 Ford, Joseph P. P.
 *Fordham, Warren, Jr.
 *Forman, William S.
 Forsberg, Robert C.
 *Forst, Ronald J.
 *Foss, Donald M.
 Fowler, Charles B., Jr.
 *Fox, James C.
 *Fox, Richard A.
 *Fox, Sharon L.
 *Frame, Don D.
 *Franks, Richard N.
 *Franks, Vernon M.
 Freckmann, Fred H.
 *Fredenburgh, Peter S.
 *Frederick, Richard A.
 Freeborn, Guy H.
 *Fuchs, Jerry L.
 *Fulcher, James M.
 *Fulghum, Judson D.
 *Fullerton, George E., Jr.
 Fuqua, James R., Jr.
 *Furminger, Harry C.
 Gainer, Thomas H., Jr.
 *Galavotti, Edward L.
 *Gallagher, Brian J.
 *Gallo, Salvatore F.
 *Garrett, Donald F.
 Garrett, William B.
 Garverick, Charles M.
 Gaskin, Roger W.
 Gaudet, John F.
 *Gee, Kirby L. B.
 *Geesaman, Wilbur L.
 Geist, Gary Q.
 *Georg, John A.
 *Gerrish, Donald A., Jr.
 *Giffillan, Thomas A., Jr.
 *Gillett, Robert M., Jr.
 *Gilmore, James G.
 Gilmore, Russell E.
 *Giltrap, Ralph M.
 Glaeser, John S.
 *Glaser, Francis E.
 *Glenn, Robert L.
 *Goldsmith, Albert L., Jr.
 *Gomez, Alvaro R.
 *Goodman, Jess T.
 *Goodwin, Robert L., Jr.
 Gordon, Robert C.
 Gordon, Samuel J.
 Gorham, Milton R., Jr.
 Gosen, Lawrence D.
 *Goto, Irving K.
 *Gracy, Ronald A.
 *Graft, Dennis T.
 *Graham, Jesse T.
 Graham, Richard H.
 Grasmuck, Robert J.
 Gray, John R., Jr.
 *Green, Allen P., III
 Griffith, John G.
 *Griggs, Eugene D.
 Grise, James E.
 *Gross, Paul E.
 *Grosse, Robert G.
 Guay, Paul E.
 *Guffey, Earl W.
 *Gulibault, Roland G.
 *Gunn, William T.
 *Gunter, Billie G.
 Habermas, Thomas W.
 *Hacker, Benjamin T.
 *Haden, Dewitt T., III
 *Hadfield, Richard R.
 *Haesloop, Carl G., Jr.
 Haffey, James M.
 Hafford, David A.
 *Hagan, Wayne E.
 *Hageman, Lyle G.
 Hagenlocker, Richard H.
 Hager, Raymond D., Jr.
 *Hahn, Donald L.
 *Hahn, John W.
 *Haigis, Erwin G., Jr.
 *Haines, Donald A.
 Hale, Thomas M., Jr.
 Haley, Wayne J.
 *Hall, Alfred L.
 *Halton, Nicholas H.
 Hamblin, Donald W.
 Hamilton, Griffin F.
 *Hamilton, William B., II
 *Hammett, Joseph H.
 Hammond, Flaye M., III
 *Hand, William R.
 Hansen, Lyle F.
 *Hanson, Martin P.
 Hardie, James S.
 *Hardin, William F.
 Hardy, Brenton P.
 Hardy, Earl L.
 Harmuth, Robert K.
 *Harper, William L.
 *Harrison, Robert G.
 *Harrod, James W.
 *Hassler, Thomas A.
 *Haugh, Charles G.
 *Hawes, John K.
 *Hawkins, Clyde D.
 Hawthorne, John W.
 *Hayden, James H.
 *Haydock, Donald G.
 *Haynes, Gene B.
 Hedgepeth, Ernest L.
 Heegeman, James W.
 Heiges, John M.
 Held, William E., Jr.
 Henderson, Joseph C.
 *Henderson, Ronald G.
 Henderson, Tomas G.
 *Hendricks, Paul V.
 Hendrickson, Daniel L.
 *Henry, Robert L.
 *Henzy, Charles B.
 Herzig, Richard W.
 Herman, Donald R.
 *Herman, Robert W.
 *Hernon, Donald M.
 *Herrick, Austin W.
 Heyden, Hanley E.
 *Hice, James R.
 *Hickling, Harley E.
 Hicks, William F.
 *Higginbotham, John D.
 *Hildebrand, Wayne T.
 Hill, Charles E.
 Hill, Edward R.
 *Hill, Glendon E.
 *Hill, Richard E.
 Hilt, John W.
 *Hite, Tom B.
 *Hittson, Ward Y.
 *Hock, Joseph T.
 *Hodge, Byron F.
 *Hodge, Don W.
 *Hoeck, Donald G.
 Hoover, Milton H.
 Hoey, John H.
 Hoff, Richard W.
 *Hoffer, Leon E., Jr.
 *Hogan, Thomas W.
 Holdorf, John C., Jr.
 Holds, James H.
 Holmes, Donald D.
 *Holmes, Frederick L.
 *Holt, Ben F., Jr.
 *Homan, Clifford F.
 Honadle, William J.
 *Hope, Lawrence A., Jr.
 Hopkins, Granville J.
 Horna, Gerald F.
 *Houghton, Harry A., Jr.
 Houley, William P.
 *Howley, Thomas F.
 Huebner, Richard F.
 *Huff, Douglas
 *Hughes, Clarence O., Jr.
 *Hunter, Richard W.
 Hupp, Michael C.
 Hurd, Robert C.
 Hurley, Michael J., Jr.
 *Hutchins, John R.
 Hydinger, Robert M.
 Ig, Raymond P.
 *Iverson, Dale A.
 *Ives, David W.
 *Jackmond, Arnold D.
 *Jackson, Jerry H.
 Jackson, William E.
 *Jacoby, Clifton G.
 James, Jon G.
 Jarvis, Thomas C.
 *Jelks, John L., III
 *Jenkins, Roger G.
 *Jerns, Robert L.
 Jesberg, Ronald H.
 *Jockel, Joseph A., Jr.
 *Johnson, Charles O.
 Johnson, Everett L.
 Johnson, Frank R., Jr.
 *Johnson, Raymond L.
 *Johnson, Roland R.
 *Johnson, Robert D.
 *Johnston, Buddy C.
 *Johnson, Joshua T. S.
 *Jones, Chilton R.
 Jones, Gordon S.
 *Jones, Howard R., Jr.
 *Jones, Jenuis B.
 Jones, Ralph W., Sr.
 *Kahler, Donald A.
 *Kalowsky, Walter W.
 *Kane, William R.
 *Kaup, Robert C.
 Keay, Karl L.
 *Keays, William E.
 Keeley, Joseph
 *Kele, Jordan, III
 *Kelley, Robert D.
 *Kellogg, Edward F.
 Kelly, David S.
 *Kelly, Robert S.
 Kelly, Thomas W., III
 *Kelly, Thomas
 Kelly, William H.
 *Kennedy, Harry W.
 Kennedy, Jerry F.
 *Kennedy, Philip J.
 *Kenney, William F.
 *Kerr, Daryl L.
 *Kessler, Robert R.
 Keyes, Bradley N.
 *Knight, James R.
 Kihune, Robert K. U.
 Kiland, Ingolf N., Jr.
 Kimble, Charles D.
 Kinch, Judson M.
 *Kindig, James N.
 *King, John J.
 King, Joseph F.
 *King, William K.
 *Kirk, Daniel K., Jr.
 Kirk, Robert G.
 *Kirkpatrick, Kenneth M.
 *Kirsch, Walter J., III
 Klein, Donald G.
 *Klett, William G.
 Kletter, David M.
 *Klipp, Eugene R.
 Klorig, William N.
 Klosky, Lowell H.
 *Knight, Walter E.
 *Koch, Frank J.
 *Kohli, Dennis W.
 Koke, Herbert E.
 Kolbensschlag, George R.
 *Kopeck, Thad L.
 Kopp, Walter H. O.
 Korrell, Harry J. F., Jr.
 *Kramer, Robert G.
 *Krasts, Ilmars
 *Krebs, Fred A.
 *Kreglo, Darrel D.
 *Kreiner, Robert F.
 Krieger, Charles B.
 *Krieger, Charles J.
 Krol, Richard M.
 Krumm, Theodore G., Jr.
 Kruzic, Victor C.
 *Kuhn, Edward R.
 *Kunkel, Barry E.
 Laferty, John D.
 *Laitala, Theodore A., Jr.
 Lambertson, Wayne R.
 *Lamer, Wayne L.
 *Lane, Robert L.
 Langdon, Stewart D.
 Langemo, James C.
 Laning, Clifford L.
 *Larsen, John T.
 Laseter, Jesse L.
 *Latorra, Benny V.
 *Lauer, Dudley S.
 *Lauk, Richard E.
 *Lavender, Carlos F.
 Law, Wilburn P.
 *Lawrence, Paul L.
 *Lax, Lee C.
 Lazarchick, Frank T.
 *Leavitt, Richard C., Jr.
 Leder, John F.
 *Lee, Leonard F.
 Leeds, John M.
 *Lehmberg, George R., Jr.
 *Leisenritt, Frederick C., III
 Leon, Hayden L., Jr.
 *Lesesne, Henry D.
 *Leshko, Thomas J.
 *Lester, Roy E.
 *Lester, Walter B., Jr.
 *Leverage, William N.
 Lewis, Michael H.
 *Liebmman, John E.
 *Lindland, Donald F.
 Lindstrom, Axel L.
 Link, Kent A.
 Livingston, Waylon A.
 *Lloyd, George T.
 *Loftus, Stephen F.
 Logalbo, Salvatore E.
 Logan, Wallis M.
 Logie, Robert W.
 *Long, Charles W.
 *Long, David E.
 *Long, James H.
 Long, Thomas A., Jr.
 *Loonam, Walter L., Jr.
 Loveless, Jerry M.
 Lovell, Jack W.
 *Luter, Thomas H.
 *Lyon, Edward, III.
 Lyon, Fred M.
 Macdonald, Bridgman A.
 Macfarlane, Byron N.
 Macgillivray, Kenneth A.
 *Mackay, David W.
 *Mackinnon, Richard A.
 *Macvean, Charles R.
 *Maher, Daniel R.
 *Maier, Peter T.
 *Maier, William H.
 *Malina, William E.
 *Mallek, George A.
 *Malsbary, Samuel C.
 *Mangol, Frederick N.
 *Mansfield, Bobby D.
 *Markowski, David L.
 Marsh, William B., Jr.
 Marshall, Bruce C.
 Marshall, Walter W.
 Martin, Glenn R.
 *Martin, Richard W.
 *Martyniak, Richard
 *Marvin, Timothy H.
 Mason, Albert T.
 *Masters, David R.
 Mathis, Elliott L.
 *Matolay, Nils A.
 *Maughlin, Richard K.
 *Maulin, William H.
 *May, David T.
 Maynard, Michael D.
 Mayo, Norman A.
 McAree, William B., II
 *McBee, Albert E.
 *McCall, Ralph B.
 *McClendon, Leigh A., III
 McCoole, Raymond A.
 *McCormick, Gerald J.
 *McCue, Jerome E.
 *McDaniel, Jerry P.
 *McDonald, George B.
 McElhenry, James P., Jr.
 *McElroy, Robert F.
 *McEwen, Robert M.
 *McFerren, Robert W.
 McGanka, Steven W.
 *McGann, Robert G.
 *McGowen, William R.
 McGrath, Paul N.
 *McGuire, Michael L.
 *McKee, Junious A., Jr.
 *McKenna, Charles A., Jr.
 *McKinney, Charles J., Jr.
 *McKinney, Henry C.
 *McLaughlin, Truman J.
 *McLaurin, Kenneth E.
 *McLocklin, Francis C.
 *McManis, David L.
 McMurtry, Jerry C.
 McVey, Charles J.
 *Medlin, William B.
 *Meeker, Charles M.
 *Mello, William M.
 *Mendenhall, Carlos C., Jr.
 *Menzel, Herbert E., Jr.
 Meredith, Francis M., II
 Merz, Arthur
 *Mesec, Gilbert R.
 Messegee, James A.
 *Mezzadri, Francis X.
 *Milantych, Nickolas I.
 Miller, Alan C.
 Miller, Charles P., III
 *Miller, Edward A.
 *Miller, Hawkins G.
 *Miller, John A.
 *Miller, Nigal E., Jr.
 Milligan, Richard D.
 Milwee, William I., Jr.
 *Mitchell, Howard D.
 *Moe, Richard B.
 *Moellmer, Karl A.
 *Moffett, Ora M.
 *Monger, Dan D.
 Montgomery, William M.
 *Moore, James C.
 *Moore, James B.
 *Moore, Leonard M.
 *Moore, Thomas J.
 *Moore, William B., Jr.
 *Morgan, Harry E., Jr.
 Morgan, Henry A., Jr.
 Morgan, James L.
 Morgan, Robert V.
 Morgan, Thomas F.
 *Morgan, William A.
 *Moroney, William M.
 *Morris, Harold D.
 *Morse, Raymond M.
 *Morse, William B.
 *Moser, John A.
 *Mosher, Norman G.
 *Mulhern, Thomas A.
 Mulken, Kevin M.
 Mulrooney, Robert M.
 *Munsinger, Melvin D.
 *Murphy, John C.
 Murray, John F.
 *Myers, William L.
 Nash, John E.
 *Neese, John F.
 Neish, John F.
 *Nelson, John P.
 *Nelson, Paul C.
 *Neuner, Frank J.
 *Newlin, John J.
 Newlon, Benjamin F.
 Neyman, George P., III
 *Nichols, James L.
 *Nichols, James R.
 Nield, Van K.
 Nissler, Charles L.
 Noble, Richard A.
 Nolan, Michael H. V.
 *Nolan, Thomas E.
 *Nollan, Walter J.
 Nordwall, Bruce D.
 Noreika, Richard J.
 Norrington, Giles R.
 North, William J.
 *Norton, Richard
 Nourie, John E.
 Nunn, Silas O., III
 *Oakie, Eugene S.
 *O'Connell, Phillip J., Jr.
 *O'Connor, Henry S., Jr.
 *O'Connor, Michael G., II
 *Oehr, Edward R., Jr.
 Oistad, Byron J.
 Olds, Frederick A.
 *Olson, Charles J., III
 *O'Malley, William J.
 *Onorato, Dominick
 Osburn, David L.
 *Osgood, Franklin B.
 *Ostrom, Robert E.
 *O'Toole, William A.
 Ovrom, Allan A., Jr.
 Owen, William E.
 Owens, James L.
 Page, David A.
 Pagnillo, Richard J.
 Paine, John A., Jr.
 Palmer, Leslie N.
 *Paradis, Paul A.
 *Parker, Richard L.
 Parks, Tom H., Jr.
 Pass, Robert L.
 Patten, John R.
 Payne, Bunyan
 *Pease, Charles C.
 *Pechauer, John N.
 Peiguss, John K.
 Pellegrini, Charles A.
 *Peltz, Theodore A.
 Pemberton, Robert B.
 Penta, Albert M.
 Permenter, Lawrence F.
 *Petersen, Halvor N.
 *Peterson, Charles A.
 *Peterson, Christopher B.
 Peterson, Charles E.
 Peterson, Charles H.
 *Petroske, Kenneth C.
 *Pfeifer, Robert D.
 *Phillips, Robert F. H.

- *Piccioni, Jerome D.
 *Pidgeon, Edward T., Jr.
 *Pippenger, William W.
 Pizinger, Lawrence C.
 *Plum, George E.
 Poffenberger, Richard L.
 Poole, James K.
 *Porter, Richard B.
 *Potter, James A.
 *Pottratz, Richard K.
 *Powell, David R.
 Powell, Richard A.
 *Powers, Philip H.
 Prendergast, Robert L.
 Price, Robert P.
 *Pyle, Jackie C.
 *Quarterman, David H.
 *Quigley, Joseph M.
 *Radecki, Richard A.
 *Rager, Richard R.
 Ramsey, James E.
 *Rankin, William R.
 *Rasmussen, Larry K.
 *Rauch, Wayne N.
 Raunig, Donald J.
 *Raynls, Harrison R.
 *Re, Joseph M.
 *Reavis, Leland H.
 Redden, Edward G.
 *Redford, Maury E., Jr.
 *Reed, William H., Jr.
 Rees, Elbert G.
 Reeves, Roy M.
 *Reid, William F.
 Reimann, Lyle F.
 *Reimann, Robert T.
 *Rein, Robert J.
 *Reinhardt, Richard L.
 Render, Ronald W.
 Renner, Ernest A.
 *Renner, William S.
 *Resare, Ronald A.
 *Reuscher, David L.
 Reynolds, James G.
 *Rhodes, Basil R.
 Rhodes, Cecil O.
 *Rhodes, Hugh W.
 *Rice, Bill B.
 *Richard, Roy A.
 Richardson, William E.
 Richardson, Daniel C.
 *Richmond, Norman W.
 Richter, Herbert B.
 Rickman, Wayne E.
 *Rickwald, Ronald R.
 Riddell, Robert A.
 *Riedel, Bernard, Jr.
 *Riess, William A.
 Riley, Larry M.
 Riley, Michael W.
 Riley, Roy G.
 *Ringle, Leander M.
 *Rivenbark, David C., Jr.
 Robbins, William T., Jr.
 *Robe, Robert W.
 *Roberts, Gary K.
 Roberts, James N.
 *Robertson, John S.
 *Robinette, Hillary M.
 *Robino, Antonio P.
 *Robinson, Wayne
 Rogers, David N.
 Rogers, George A., Jr.
 Rogers, Will, Jr.
 *Rommel, John R.
 Roscoe, David, R.
 *Rose, Clifford A., Jr.
 Rosenberger, Glenn C.
 *Roth, James E.
 *Roth, Robert M.
 *Rowles, John F., III
 *Rowley, Cornelius M.
 Roy, Arthur
 *Ruby, Scott M.
 Ryan, Thomas R., III
 *Sajdera, Robert M.
 *Sanders, Sheldon, M.
 *Sandke, William K.
 Santos, Alfred J., Jr.
 Santos, Leonard B.
 *Sargeant, Richard W.
 *Savage, Billy B.
 *Sawdey, Philip G.
 Sawhook, James L.
 *Schaper, Darwin, E.
 *Schauer, Allan D.
 Schick, Bruce J.
 Schliffner, Robert C.
 *Schluntz, Frank R.
 Schneider, Edward L.
 Schoneman, Elmer C.
 *Schrader, Norman E., Jr.
 *Schrag, Larry P.
 Schroeder, Donald L.
 *Schroeder, Gerard R.
 Schultz, John J.
 *Schuyler, Paul G.
 *Schwarzenbach, Hart J., Jr.
 *Schweizer, Otto A., Jr.
 Scott, Lawrence S.
 Scott, William M., Jr.
 Seeley, James R.
 Seldin, Carl I.
 Seykowski, Donald W.
 Sharp, Grant A.
 *Shattuck, William D.
 Shaw, John F.
 *Shea, John J.
 *Sheets, William A.
 *Shelby, Lawrence T.
 Shelton, Donald
 *Sheppard, Furman L., Jr.
 *Sherlock, Wilbur J.
 *Sherman, John M.
 Shiverdecker, David K.
 *Shoquist, David R.
 Siembieda, John
 Sigmund, Samuel W.
 *Silverman, Richard A.
 *Simon, James W.
 Siple, Terrence E.
 *Skrukrud, Clare E.
 Slaven, John K.
 Smith, Bradley N.
 *Smith, Clinton L.
 *Smith, Darryl W.
 *Smith, Gary T.
 Smith, Gibson P.
 Smith, John S.
 *Smith, Leverage O.
 Smith, Peter D.
 *Smith, Ralph E.
 *Smith, Roger A., Jr.
 *Smith, Wayne A.
 *Smith, William P.
 *Smoot, John H.
 *Snyder, Carl L.
 *Snyder, Stephen V.
 *Somes, Timothy E.
 *Sopko, John R.
 Sorensen, Howard W.
 *Sparks, Neil R., Jr.
 *Springer, Judson H.
 *Springstead, Lester K.
 Spruelli, Alfred H., Jr.
 *Squire, Walter W., Jr.
 *Stahel, Ervin D.
 *Staiger, Martin
 Stanford, David L.
 *Stangle, William J.
 *Stanley, James E.
 *Starbird, Gary L.
 Starck, Robin L.
 *Staudenmayer, Frederick G.
 *Steckler, Charles T.
 *Steele, Harry A., Jr.
 Stephens, Daniel P.
 *Stevick, Jerold C., Jr.
 *Stewart, Wayne B.
 Stillwell, William H.
 *Stith, Charles E.
 *Stoskstad, Ralph F.
 Stoessl, Leslie
 *Stouppe, David E.
 Stout, Peter C.
 *Stout, Richard D.
 Strachwitz, Hubert J.
 *Straight, Donald O.
 Stratton, Sylvan D.
 *Street, Robert W.
 *Strickland, Virgil E., Jr.
 *Strohshel, George H.
 Strommer, Frederick A.
 *Strong, Bruce W.
 Stutzer, William T.
 *Sudholz, Herman O.
 *Suereth, Elwood J.
 Sullivan, Donald K.
 Sullivan, David D.
 Sullivan, John L.
 *Sures, Glynn
 *Surrells, Roy E.
 Susag, Gary R.
 *Susalla, Ernest F.
 *Syoboda, Henry D., Jr.
 *Swanson, Leonard B., Jr.
 *Sweeney, Charles J., Jr.
 *Szczypinski, Walter S., Jr.
 *Taipale, Raymond D.
 *Talbert, Lee R.
 *Tallant, James G.
 Tamony, Joseph M.
 Targgaard, Peter T., Jr.
 *Taylor, John K.
 Taylor, Raynor A. K.
 *Teagle, Harvey M., Jr.
 *Teague, Robert A.
 Temple, Nicholas B.
 *Templeton, Robert N.
 *Tew, Ben R.
 Thomas, Edgar A.
 *Thomas, James P. L.
 *Thomas, Richard W.
 *Thomas, Robert D.
 Thomas, William L., Jr.
 Thompson, Alton K.
 *Thompson, Durwood O.
 *Thompson, Fred E.
 Thompson, Stanley P.
 *Thorne, Charles E.
 Thresher, Alfred A., II
 *Thune, Donald B.
 Tiedemann, Hollie J., Jr.
 Timby, William H.
 *Tingle, Adrian A.
 *Todaro, Fred M.
 Todd, Bennett E., Jr.
 Tomajczyk, Charles F., Jr.
 *Tomcavage, Norman J.
 Touchstone, Frederick F., Jr.
 Touhey, Robert J.
 Tracy, Leslie R.
 *Treadway, Loyd E.
 *Trollope, Richard G.
 Trossbach, Ronald C.
 Troyer, David D.
 Truax, Daniel M.
 *Truax, Robert C.
 Tuggle, Ralph E.
 *Turczyn, Daniel W.
 *Turgeon, Robert E., Jr.
 *Turkington, William W., III
 *Turner, Lewis D.
 *Turner, Tom D.
 *Tuthill, Donald L.
 *Vaden, Stephen J.
 *Vanatta, Jerry L.
 *Vance, John W., III
 *Vansickle, Gerald E.
 *Vaughan, Joseph S.
 *Vaughn, Harold J.
 *Veazey, Sidney E.
 *Venter, David G.
 *Venters, Leon S., Jr.
 *Verney, George M.
 Vettesse, Joseph J.
 *Vincent, Charles D.
 *Vogt, Larry G.
 Volgenau, Douglas
 *Voll, Mathew W.
 Walker, Harry C.
 Walker, John W.
 Wallace, Michael W.
 *Waller, James W.
 Walls, Robert G.
 Walters, Arthur K., Jr.
 *Waples, John M.
 Ward, John P.
 Wardlow, Louis B.
 *Ware, Downey M.
 *Warmbir, Kenneth M.
 Warson, Toby G.
 *Waters, Irving A., Jr.
 Webster, Edward C.
 *Weeks, Dennis C.
 Welkert, John P.
 *Weir, Robert H.
 Wellborn, Raymond B.
 *Wenger, Richard O.
 *Wertz, Peter D.
 West, Eugene H.
 *West, Norris R.
 *West, Ward L.
 Westfahl, Richard K.
 Weston, Robert M., Jr.
 *Whalen, Rodney N.
 Wheaton, William C.
 Wheeler, James R.
 *Wheeler, Wayne H.
 Whipples, Russell E.
 *Whitby, Ralph E., Jr.
 *White, Richard D.
 *White, Robert
 *Whittaker, Thomas K.
 *Wiersema, Edward K.
 *Wightman, Carl A.
 *Wilcox, Guy I.
 Wilcox, Ronald C.
 *Wildner, Wallace G.
 *Wile, Alan R., Jr.
 *Wilkins, Perry
 *Williams, Edward M.
 *Williams, John H., Jr.
 *Williams, John R.
 *Williams, James K., Jr.
 Williams, Orville M.
 Williams, Robert A.
 Williams, Windell V.
 *Williams, Willis T.
 Williamson, Frederick M.
 Williamson, Mark H.
 Williamson, James R.
 *Wilson, Alger L.
 Wilson, Charles M., Jr.
 *Wilson, Dennis K.
 *Wilson, James P.
 *Wingo, Robert F.
 *Winningham, Norman L.
 Winter, Richard F.
 *Winthrop, Griffith J.
 *Wirth, Andrew M.
 Wirth, William T.
 *Withers, John H.
 *Witherspoon, Emanuel E.
 *Wold, Robert M.
 *Wolf, John D.
 *Wolynies, Jon G.
 *Wood, Phillip R.
 *Woods, John P.
 *Wrenn, Raymond W., Jr.
 *Wright, William A.
 *Wynn, Walter P., Jr.
 *Yeager, Gary W.
 York, Milton W.
 *Young, Bobbie R.
 *Young, Ernest T., Jr.
 *Young, James M.
 Young, James T.
 *Young, Robert A.
 *Young, Robert B.
 Young, Vernon O.
 *Young, William K., Jr.
 *Zachary, William H., Jr.
 Zanzot, Warren L.
 *Zimdar, Robert E.
 *Zimmer, Gerald G.
 *Zimmermann, Jack G.

MEDICAL CORPS

- Abbe, Robert R.
 Anderson, Seth E., Jr.
 Applegate, William R.
 Bass, George L., Jr.
 Bedell, Paul F.
 Beebe, David B.
 Berg, Howard S.
 Birch, Alexander A., Jr.
 Bormanis, Peteris
 Bowen, Benjamin C.
 Boyle, Robert S.
 Brault, Thomas G.
 Briscoe, Edward G.
 Briska, Philip T.
 *Brown, Charles S.
 Brown, Edwin G.
 Browning, Robert W.
 Buehl, Frederick H.
 Bullock, Ronald E.
 Burt, Robert W.
 Busby, Dennis R.
 Byrnes, Thomas H., Jr.
 *Campbell, Walker H.
 Campbell, Harold J., Jr.
 Carlson, Hillis G.
 Carson, Richard C.
 Case, Roger S.
 Cavenar, Jesse O., Jr.
 *Charneco, Dale R.
 Clark, Thomas L.
 *Collins, Frank B.
 *Corley, Thomas E.
 Crafts, Bryan C.
 *Crary, Paul D., Jr.
 Deely, William J.
 Demaagd, Harvey J.
 Dempsey, Richard L.
 Dickinson, Johnny A.
 Disilvio, Thomas V.
 Donahoo, Stanley E.
 *Drake, Anthony M.
 Dunkelberg, John R.
 Dupuy, Theodore E.
 Echols, William B.
 Eder, Kenneth W.
 Edwards, Robert W.
 Ellis, Edward A.
 Emery, John B., Jr.
 Evans, Jerry J.
 Fargason, Crayton A.
 Feehan, Edward B.
 *Foote, William W.
 Fowler, Donald R.
 Funkhouser, John J.
 Gallup, Donald G.
 *Gay, Robert M.
 *Geer, Bruce R.
 Geremia, Vincent F., Jr.
 Gill, William L.
 Gillingham, David R.
 Green, Albert J.
 Greenberg, Earl B.
 Gunlock, Howard D.
 Hamilton, William R.
 Hanlon, Thomas M., Jr.
 Haugland, David O.
 Hoffman, Charles J.
 *Holik, Joseph L.
 Horne, Edwin G., Jr.
 Hunsicker, Lawrence G.
 Hunter, Joseph A.
 R. Hutchins, Kenneth R.
 *Jamarik, George T., Jr.
 Jansen, George A.
 Jarzynski, Donald J.
 Johnson, Raymond B.
 Johnson, Francis C.
 *Jones, Gaines F.
 Kaiser, Dale C.
 Kelli, Ralph H., Jr.
 Kelly, Thaddeus E.
 Kemp, John E.
 Knipstein, Thomas W.
 Koschmann, Edgar B.
 Kruse, John C.
 Larese, Ricci J.
 Larson, Rodney A.
 Lestage, Daniel B.
 Leverett, Cary L.
 *Looney, George R.
 Luckstead, Eugene F.
 Maas, Charles F. J.
 *Mancuso, Frank S.
 Marlowe, Frank I.
 McClung, Herbert C.
 McCurley, William S., III
 *McDonald, Kenneth M.
 McDonald, Harold D.
 McMillian, James R.
 Mock, Charles R.
 Moore, Laurie W., Jr.
 Morioka, Wilfred T.
 Moskowitz, David L.
 *Moyes, James R.
 Murdoch, Malcolm M.
 *Murphy, Michael O.
 *Nall, Richard L.
 Nernoff, John, III
 Nevel, William G.
 Nevils, Bobby G.
 Nickerson, Harlan J.
 Otto, Ralph N.
 Pernowicz, Stanley E., Jr.
 Peterson, Roger D.
 Petrone, Gerard S.
 Phelps, Legrande J.
 Pinkstaff, Thomas H.
 Pool, Sam L.
 Pratt, Russell W.
 Prendergast, Neal J.
 Ratner, Irving P.
 *Reeb, Paul R., Jr.
 Reeves, Charles S.
 *Reeves, David M.
 *Reid, James W., Jr.
 *Reimer, Donald R.
 Reppart, John T.
 Risinger, Donald L.
 Salisbury, Robert B.
 Saunders, Marvous
 Sawyer, Robert N.
 *Schrivier, John A.
 *Sears, Henry J. T.
 Shepard, William D.
 Skoglund, Rayburn R.
 Smit, Robin L.
 Smith, Robert L.
 Smith, Robert W.
 Snider, Walter H., Jr.

Speck, Arthur L.
 *Spence, James E.
 Sprafke, Donald F.
 Steffens, James L.
 Stover, James F.
 *Strader, Richard P.
 *Taylor, Britton E.

Tyson, John P.
 *Westervelt, Harold A.
 Wilken, Francis D.
 Wilson, Joseph R.
 Winker, Joel E.
 Wood, Ernest M., Jr.

Ransdell, Maurice G.
 *Rausch, John A.
 *Reed, David A.
 *Robie, Ralph L., Jr.
 Roth, Jon B.
 *Rumpf, Robert L.
 *Russell, Joseph F., III

Steidle, Robert E.
 *Taylor, John T.
 *Tefft, Willis M.
 *Tempest, Edward H.
 *Troia, Peter J., Jr.
 *Twaddle, David L.
 Vall, James C.
 *Verplaetse, Ronald A.
 *Vevoda, George L.
 Visniski, Walter W., Jr.
 *Vonachen, Donald D.
 Wadsworth, William T.
 *Walker, Samuel J.
 *Walther, Harrison N.
 *Webb, Robert D.
 *Webber, Randall E.
 Welsh, Gerald H.
 *Wheeler, "J" "C." Jr.
 *Whitty, Neldon V.
 Williams, John P.
 *Willis, Gerald W.
 *Wolcott, John N.
 *Wolff, Norman D.
 *Wood, Allen
 Wright, Joe B.
 Yeager, Howard B.

*Delaossa, Arthur D.
 Demeyer, John H.
 Dice, James E.
 Emery, Clare A., Jr.
 *Ervin, Melvin, Jr.
 Felger, Milton R.
 Fjerstad, James H.
 Fortman, Kenneth V.
 Geppert, John K.
 Heibel, John L., Jr.
 Hensley, Paul E.
 Hicks, Morris L.
 Hirschfeld, William E.
 Ho, Patrick
 Holtan, James R.
 Imlach, William E.
 Julienne, Charles H.
 *Kawahara, Charles M.
 Knehans, William E.
 Lane, Jerry L.
 *Lorbeck, James C.
 *Lufkin, John C.
 Mathers, James M.
 McWilliams, Robert B.

Moscarillo, Thomas L.
 Mowad, Massoud G.
 Nelson, Ronald T.
 *Niesar, George F.
 Oatis, George W., Jr.
 Peru, Charles B.
 Porter, John W.
 Richardson, William G.
 Robinson, Gary C.
 Rosenfeld, Jerry
 *Schaberg, Siegfried J.
 *Sharp, Bobby M.
 Siegal, Don E.
 Sirmans, Alan G.
 Streicher, Carl W.
 *Sugg, Thomas H.
 *Triplett, Robert G.
 *Vanmeter, Milton C., Jr.
 Vazzana, Lorenzo S.
 Woodsmall, James T.
 Young, Raymond F., Jr.

SUPPLY CORPS

*Adams, Paul K.
 *Allen, Raymond B.
 Armour, Robert C.
 *Arnold, James L.
 *Asche, Richard E.
 *Avery, Bruce F.
 *Avilesalfaro, Bolivar, Jr.
 *Awada, James G.
 *Bacher, Gerald J.
 *Bayles, Ronald S.
 *Bell, Ronald M.
 *Bender, James L.
 *Blair, John W.
 Billings, Thomas H.
 *Biver, David A.
 *Blackwell, Lind B.
 *Bloom, Jardine C.
 *Boesch, Frederick E., Jr.
 *Boese, Fred M.
 Boltz, Jacob
 Bounds, Charles D.
 *Brassington, Abram A.
 *Bryant, William W.
 Bryant, James N.
 *Bush, William J.
 Cash, John J.
 *Chase, Thane B.
 *Christen, Jimmy E.
 Christensen, Thomas W.
 *Clemente, Vincent F.
 *Cole, Peter S.
 *Coogan, Timothy P.
 Cooper, Donald R.
 Crane, Lee D.
 *Crooks, Robert E., Jr.
 *Crosby, Alexander C.
 *Crouch, Donald G.
 *Cunningham, John J., Jr.
 Cunningham, Philip T.
 *Custis, John P.
 *Dardis, Ernest C.
 Dean, Claire, T., Jr.
 *Dean, Robert W.
 Defrank, Frederick J.
 *Demayo, Peter
 Dempsey, Edward J.
 *Doane, Charles B.
 Drinnon, James W., Jr.
 *Dumke, David R.
 *Dyches, James W.
 *Ebey, John R.
 Eckelberger, James E.
 *Edmondson, Aaron D.
 Erickson, Roger C.
 *Evans, Steven H.
 *Farley, Robert H., III
 *Fedora, John
 *Felt, John D.
 Filipiak, Francis L.
 Flammger, Jerome T.
 *Fogle, William H., Jr.
 Fournier, Alexander F., III
 *Frizzell, Frank L., Jr.
 *Goodman, Jack R.
 Granucci, Richard A.
 *Gray, Kenneth W.
 Greenhalgh, John E.
 Groom, Robert W.
 Grossman, Stephen Z.
 Hadbavny, John W.
 Hamlin, Rudolph B.
 Hardin, Jonathon J., Jr.
 *Harris, Neal L.

*Hatchett, John W.
 *Hauenstein, William H.
 *Haver, David J.
 Hay, Vernon M.
 Heavener, Richard W.
 *Henion, Alan M.
 *Hessler, Blair
 *Hickey, Daniel F., Jr.
 *Hickman, William B., Jr.
 *Huffman, Haldon J.
 Hulan, Milton T.
 *Jackson, Leon A.
 *Jaminet, John A.
 *Jarrett, William A.
 *Johnson, Edward M., Jr.
 *Jones, Everett L., III
 *Jones, Ramon W.
 Jordan, James C., Jr.
 *Jubinski, Stephen
 *Julian, Gerald P.
 *Kaley, Don R.
 Kasputys, Joseph E.
 *Kaiser, James A.
 Kelly, James A.
 *Kenin, David
 Kenney, Thomas R.
 Knachel, Robert E.
 Knapp, Emmett J.
 Koczur, Eugene
 *Koncar, William R.
 *Krawower, Matthew A.
 *Krapels, Cornelius A.
 *Krummel, John C.
 *Krusse, Marlin L.
 Kubasch, Donley D.
 *Kwolek, John R.
 Leber, Theodore T., Jr.
 Ledwig, Donald E.
 Lee, Richard H.
 *Leeson, Donald D.
 Leisenring, Richard P.
 Ligon, Samuel J., Jr.
 *Lynam, Edward J.
 *Lynch, Ronald P.
 *Lytle, James A.
 Machesky, John M.
 March, Frederick W.
 *Marshall, Solomon W., Jr.
 *McAdams, William M.
 *McAllister, Dudley S., Jr.
 *McClay, Quinton L.
 *McWhorter, Fred O.
 Meier, John D.
 *Mezzio, George H.
 Moore, Richard J.
 Morehouse, Stephen H.
 *Nagele, Eugene E.
 *Napier, William L.
 *Natelson, Lawrence S.
 *Nettles, Lawrence J.
 *Newton, James E.
 Noble, Francis E.
 *O'Donnell, John P.
 *Omarah, James L.
 *Orr, Thomas E.
 *Ott, Thomas S.
 *Overman, Douglas R.
 *Parker, Charles E.
 *Parsons, Frank W.
 Peck, Leo J.
 *Pierce, Gordon E., Jr.
 Powell, William E., Jr.
 *Rader, Lynden L.

Ammons, James E., Jr.
 *Boyer, Richard A.
 *Boyette, Earl L.
 Collins, John T.
 *Cunningham, Robert R.
 *Derengowski, Casimir, A.
 *Doffin, James E., Jr.
 *Dorsey, Jack E.
 *Driscoll, Walter L.
 *Eyer, Marvin L.
 *Gibson, William M.
 *Harper, Rhodes W.
 *Hathaway, Dudley C.
 Hegeman, Arthur E., Jr.
 *Henry, Myron B.
 *Hiskett, Walter A.
 Keys, Robert L.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

*Landreville, Raphael P.
 *Lewis, Herbert T.
 *Luffman, Elden H.
 *McCarthy, Ronald W.
 *McCue, Richard T.
 *Myatt, Bobby W.
 *Olson, Donald I.
 *Paciocco, Robert J.
 *Pearson, Paul W.
 *Pepera, Alfred S.
 *Pfannenstiel, James D.
 *Smith, Hugh D.
 *Smith, William A.
 *Uhles, Paul F.
 *Walke, Patrick J.
 Walker, John F.
 *Wood, Roy C.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Austin, Donald R.
 Biondo, Donald J.
 Boothe, Allen P.
 Booth, Robert M.
 Bottorff, David E.
 Byers, Eugene W.
 Currie, Wayne L.
 Davis, Gene
 Dettbarn, John L.
 Emsley, Thomas H.
 Enyedy, Joseph M. II
 Farbarik, John J.
 Fraunces, George D.
 Gunther, John A.
 *Harper, Melvin H.
 Herig, William E., Jr.
 Horacek, Jerry L.
 Ives, Jon R.
 Jacobsen, John R.
 *Jones, Ralph K.
 Kau, Julian M. F.
 Kloecker, Paul V.
 Lafond, John A.
 Laton, Richard W.
 Lewis, Quentin E. D.
 Martin, Roger G.
 Matthews, William G.
 McCorvey, Donald L., Jr.
 Monarch, Delmont J.
 *Moss, George
 Muir, Michael D.
 Naegle, Frederick D.
 *O'Connor, Peter
 Osborn, James H.
 Oswald, Thomas H., Jr.
 Parisius, Philip J.
 Patterson, Joe T., Jr.
 Perez, Johnny
 Podbielski, Victor
 Preston, Robert L.
 Reeves, Dwain
 Ricker, Norman G., Jr.
 Ruth, Allen R.
 Sayner, William V., Jr.
 Shackelford, Robert H., Jr.
 Short, Roy E.
 Smart, Robert D.
 *Swistock, John R.
 Tack, Curtis A.
 Thomas, Eugene W.
 Thornton, Paul A.
 Tibbetts, Jonathan C., Jr.
 Updegrove, Loyal R.
 Wagner, David R.
 Weiss, Ralph C.
 Wells, Howard A., Jr.
 Williams, "O" Jay
 Wisenbaker, Richard Y.
 *Wood, William L.

DENTAL CORPS

*Archer, Jerald J.
 *Blanchard, Donald G., Jr.
 *Boles, Michael E.
 Bollinger, Thomas E.
 *Bronan, Anthony W., Jr.
 Branyan, Carl E.
 *Calder, David R.
 *Chandler, Leonard P., Jr.
 Cook, Robert C.
 *Cooper, Charles A.
 Coykendall, Alan L.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Anderson, Francis G., Jr.
 Auton, William J.
 Bagnall, Donald L.
 *Blake, John P.
 Bleh, Harry W.
 Boyle, John A., Jr.
 Bristow, Bertram W.
 *Brugman, Arthur P.
 Butler, Robert C.
 *Clayton, Walter H., Jr.
 *Cole, Charles C.
 Conover, Frederic G.
 Delaney, Thomas J.
 *Demo, James R.
 Dewey, William A.
 *Egan, David J.
 *Erickson, Carl E.
 *Faherty, Francis X.
 *Fallers, Harry R., Jr.
 Ferguson, Donald R.
 *Fitts, Marvin L.
 Geiger, Robert E.
 *Godfrey, Walter A., Jr.
 Graves, Joseph L.
 Hammett, Gene L.
 *Harrison, Don C., Jr.
 Harris, George S.
 *Hassey, Jasper T.
 Hensle, Harold R.
 Hinds, Robert B.
 Hines, Kenneth F.
 *Hourihan, Catherine P.
 *Jenkins, Lawrence J., Jr.
 *Johnson, Jimmie H.
 *Johnson, Ralph W.
 Jones, Bob A., Jr.
 *Krollman, Richard W.
 Laliberty, George W.
 Lawson, Charles W.
 Liming, John W., Jr.
 *Martin, Melton L.
 McCullagh, Robert F.
 *Meitl, Eugene F.
 Menges, Robert P.
 Mountain, Charles R.
 *Nelson, Jack A.
 Pavlick, John E.
 Pritchard, Glenn E.
 Reeves, Donald E.
 Richardson, Fredric M.
 Richardson, Langston E., Jr.
 *Roper, Charles A.
 Schroeder, William H.
 *Spiegler, Joel B.
 *Spurgeon, Troy L.
 Stell, James J.
 Teague, Francis A., Jr.
 *Thompson, James C.
 *Tiller, Charles E.
 *Vedros, Neylan A.
 *Weidner, Wilfred I.
 Wentworth, Richard L.
 Wire, George W.
 *Wright, Donald N.
 Zimmerman, Lonnie V.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

*Crane, William A.
 *Drapeau, John W.
 *Elliott, William P., Jr.
 *Hoffman, James L., Jr.
 *Kercheval, John W., II
 *Kirkpatrick, Milton W., Jr.
 *Nerseth, Marvin P.
 *Sweeney, James W.
 *Trocki, Daniel B.
 *VanSlate, Jean E.
 Ziemniak, Daniel J.

NURSE CORPS

*Anderson, Dolores E.
 *Arthur, Margaret J.
 *Baker, Mary E.
 *Baker, Claire H.
 *Clunan, Claudette C.
 *Conway, Margaret M.
 *Cornwell, Norma J.
 *Crumpton, Frances L.
 Dunn, Julie J.
 *Durupt, Monica V.
 *Edwards, Karen E. C.
 *Fillmore, Elizabeth J.
 *Jennett, Jo A.
 *Kelly, Margo S.
 *Kendall, Kathleen M.
 *Koester, Helen M.
 *Ledgerwood, Mary C.
 *Leuenberger, Patricia I.
 *Link, Laveta F.
 *Lochte, Rose M.
 *Masters, Eleanor M.
 *McNair, Joan A.
 *Meehan, Mary K.
 *Merrill, Shirley E.
 *Nehr, Rosalie R.
 *Otsson, Joan
 *Patterson, Carol E.
 *Peters, Edna L.
 *Rollins, Jean C.
 *Ross, Stella A.
 *Scott, Janet

*Stewart, Nicola J. *Warner, Patricia A.
 *Swanson, Joan F. *Wilhelmy, Catherine
 *Swetonic, Marjorie A. M.
 *Thomas, Shirlee, Y. *Zatzariny, Tanya

The following-named officers for promotion to the grade of chief warrant officer, W-4 subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Higgins, Dean S. Leamons, John B.
 Jones, Robert W. Welch, Stanley C.

The following-named officers for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Achuff, Walter D., III Hinds, Howard H., Jr.
 Allen, Harry B. Hoover, Charles B.
 Bergstrand, Robert E. Howze, Odis W., Jr.
 Blades, Peter D. Huffines, Charles W.
 Bobo, Wilton C., Jr. Jones, Martin J.
 Boghenrikssen, Knut Larson, Douglas A.
 M. Larson, Gary L.
 Boswell, Dale E. Lassiter, Rex D.
 Burman, George A. Lefavor, David A.
 Button, Earle D., Jr. Leonard, Emery S., Jr.
 Carty, John R. Lowell, Bobbie R.
 Cogswell, Thomas M. Lull, Thomas E.
 Cook, Oren F. Maguire, Edward S.
 Cummings, Ronald L. Marcely, James A.
 Dix, Michael A. Matyas, Joseph J.
 Doroshenko, Theodore Miller, Dennis L.
 Fantin, Jonnie R. Morrissey, Thomas K.
 Flanagan, Alan B. O'Brien, John I., Jr.
 French, Gary L. Ohlander, Ronald B.
 Fulton, David S. Roe, Charles R.
 Gravley, Thomas W. Slay, Billy R.
 Hadley, Allan W. Strickland, Duward K.
 Hargis, Richard A. Sufana, Ronald J.
 Harrison, Edward J., Jr. Taylor, Billy G.
 Jr. Tajuague, Ronald B.
 Hawley, Thomas P., Jr. Vigil, Leonard V.
 Hays, James M. Wall, James H.

SUPPLY CORPS

Bollam, Kenneth A. Kasse, David I.
 Christopher, Donald Klizer, John L.
 D. Moles, Robert F.
 Dobkowitz, Richard P. Morgan, Edward A., Jr.
 Dolan, James P. O'Connor, John, Jr.
 Dunkle, James A. Robertson, Herbert M.
 Hoskins, Thomas T., Simpson, Steven E.
 III Thielemann, Richard J.
 Kaplan, Paul E. Tuggle, Richard C.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Baratta, Mario A.
 Connelie, Thomas P.
 Riggan, Donald C., Jr.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Fisher, Frank D. R.
 Galbreath, Jerry D.
 Strong, Douglas M.

NURSE CORPS

Caya, Barbara A.
 Langley, Ann

The following-named women officers for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Adsit, Carol A. Rice, Sue A.
 Burman, Rita M. Sheppard, Beverly F.
 Donovan, Joan M. VonWantoeh, Jordine
 Driver, Mary L. S.
 Jackson, Virginia E. Williams, Barbara M.

SUPPLY CORPS

McMorrow, Janice R.

The following-named women officers for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

*Asterisk indicates ad interim appointment.

LINE

Adamski, Frances B. A. McClain, Eileen
 Bowman, Constance G. McKnight, Lillie M.
 Carmen, Marie M. Nazarenus, Dorothy
 Cook, Cheryl S. M.
 Cross, Ruth A. Olsen, Lynette M.
 Currie, Louise B. Phelan, Elizabeth A.
 Cutter, Mary A. Pickens, Marilu R.
 Francisco, Donna L. Powell, Eleanor L.
 Franjevic, Barbara L. Russell, Mary E.
 Goldman, Joanne B. Safford, Sylvia A.
 Haan, Linda L. Sambrook, Susan L.
 Hansen, Kathleen Spencer, Betty C.
 Haupt, Katherine L. Turner, Margie L.
 Holmes, Gloria A. Usborne, Elizabeth L.
 Johnston, Mary A. Verry, Rita L.
 Jungels, Daneen L. Walton, Marguerite A.
 Lincoln, Grace V. Ward, Gail M.
 Lins, Dorothy K. Winsley, Mary B.
 Logan, Linda L. Yates, Serena E.
 Lonigan, Susan H.

SUPPLY CORPS

Ginn, Donna K. McWhorter, Paula L.
 Hodgins, Jane S. Olsen, Linnea M.
 Eric T. Helland (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and a temporary lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.
 The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:
 Steven L. Bennett
 Herbert J. Stanton
 Oris T. Thetford

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:
 Lawrence J. Duane, Michael D. Stenberg
 Jr. Jerold J. Yecies

Courtland L. Monroe, Jr.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers) Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line or staff corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Gary K. Anderson Richard A. Hedin
 Robert R. Ambridge Kevern R. Joyce
 John D. Ball Patrick J. Kusiak
 Leslie J. Berkes David P. Maloney
 Richard E. Boucher Daniel E. Monagle
 David E. Boyd Thomas J. Moore
 Joseph L. Clapper John S. Nelson
 William J. Clark III Henry O. Nicol III
 William M. Curran Stanley W. Pawlowski
 John D. Curran John S. Pillsbury
 John H. Day George P. Posnak
 Edward S. Dillion John W. Schick
 Gerard M. J. Donovan John W. Schweizer
 Robert A. Forney Michael J. Seaman
 Frederick R. Goldmeyer James R. Treglio
 William F. Green George D. Uffenorde
 William F. Grun Dyrck H. VanDusen
 Steven M. Hamilton Kenneth G. Wikle

Terry L. Barton (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

"T" "J" Rundle
 Donald E. Sampson

William J. Storz, Jr. (Naval Reserve officer), to be a commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Paul F. Bolding, Jr., U.S. naval officer to be reverted to a permanent chief warrant officer W-3 and a temporary chief warrant

officer W-4, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line or staff corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William M. Adney William C. Bowers
 Robert P. Airgood Richard A. Boyd
 Daniel W. Aljoe John E. Bradley, Jr.
 Randall C. Allen Samuel A. Bradley
 Charles C. Aller Donald R. Brady
 Larry R. Ammerman James P. Brady
 Edward L. Anderson William R. Brandon
 Randall M. Anderson Gary L. Brandt
 Wayne E. Anderson Robert E. Brandt, Jr.
 William N. Anderson Grant O. Braschel
 James M. Andrews, Jr. Patrick W. Brawley
 Stephen T. Andrews Paul A. Bray II
 William A. Angus III William D. Bremer
 James S. Angyal Carleton B. Brink
 Kenneth G. App Roger W. Briston
 Russel L. Appleyard Gregory W. Brose
 Gerald B. Arnold James D. Brotherton
 Richard S. Arnold Charles P. T. Brown
 Stein Asbjornsen John A. Brown
 Terry J. Atherton Stuart L. Brown
 Gregg H. Averett Kenneth P. Bryant
 Donald C. Baker Albert J. Budney, Jr.
 Timothy W. Baker Melvin J. Bulman
 Jerome R. Banks James M. Burin
 Robert A. Baran Robert M. Burr
 David L. Bardal Thomas L. Busekrus
 William L. Bargar William H. Butler
 Gerard J. Barrett John A. Buxton
 John D. Barrett William E. Byrd
 John G. Barrett Richard A. Caddell
 Philip W. Basquin Robert S. Cahn
 Joseph E. Bass William E. Caldwell
 Tyler J. Bateman Grover R. Caloway
 Dean J. Bauer Richard M. Camp
 Frederick H. Baugh III Eugene L.
 Julian E. Baum III Campagnole
 Ronald K. Bayer John H. Cardellina II
 James E. Beakley Charles J. Carlise
 Alan R. Beam Ernest W. Carman
 Christopher S. Becker Thomas R. Carper
 Gerard F. Becker James A. Carter
 William J. Bedell George E. Casey, Jr.
 Roy S. Belcher III James F. Casey, Jr.
 James M. Bell Clifton B. Cates III
 Robert L. Bellafronto Michael P. Cavanaugh
 John J. Bello William L. Cepeda
 William R. Beltz James E. Chelsson
 Richard J. A. Bendel Howard M. Chatham
 John H. Benson Manson H. Cheek
 Glenn F. Berg James E. Chestnut
 Gerald V. Bergman Charles H. Church III
 Leslie C. Berthy Joseph L. Clapper
 Zigurd J. Berzins Richard B. Charuhas
 Parker J. Beverage Carl C. Christensen
 William B. Bierbower John L. Christenson
 John J. Bingham, Jr. Charles D.
 Donald C. Bishop Christopher
 Kenneth R. Bishop Jerry A. Clements
 Gerald L. Black Darby T. Coker, Jr.
 Terrence W. Black Peter W. Cole
 William R. Blackburn Richard J. Cole II
 William A. Blair Richard W. Cole
 Leroy W. Blankenship Stockton B. Colt, Jr.
 Mark R. Blankenship Joseph P. Connellan
 Norman W. Blatt John T. Connelly
 Ross E. Blumberg Bruce H. Connors
 Ronald B. Bobo Robert J. Conyers
 Gregory S. Bodenhorn George C. Cooley
 Don W. Boehler, Jr. Bruce P. Cooper
 Dan C. Boger William R. Cooper
 Paul M. Boire Edward J. Cordes, Jr.
 William H. Boles, Jr. Richard Corn III
 Paul F. Bolinger Malcolm D. Corner, Jr.
 Gerhard H. Bonas, Jr. Gerard M. Corrigan
 David S. Bonnet Robert M. Cosgrove
 Ross F. Bonny, Jr. William T. Cottle
 David L. Booher William J. Coughlin
 *Stephen R. Booher Joseph A. Couture
 Peter G. Boorum Robert L. Cowan, Jr.
 Brian N. Borg James D. Crabb
 Charles M. Boswell Richard R. Crater
 Duane B. Bower Edward R. Craven

Chadwick G. Creamer
 Anthony E. Cristina
 Michael A. Crouch
 Barry L. Croucher
 James E. Crumrine
 Ronald P. Cryslar
 Joseph E. Culver
 David L. Cunningham
 Kenneth N. Cunningham
 Reed L. Cunningham
 Thomas A. Cunningham
 James A. Curtin
 Lee R. Curtis
 David E. Cyrus
 Frederick F. Dagostino
 James A. Daly, Jr.
 Allan S. Dam
 Mark D. Damsgaard
 William J. Dandalides
 Terry A. Danielson
 David P. Darsney
 Robert G. Dashiell
 Bill T. Davenport
 Dean O. Davis, Jr.
 Patrick C. Davis
 Charles A. DeJohn
 John H. Derry, Jr.
 William Deleeuw
 Michael T. Derrico
 Terry R. Dettmann
 Joseph V. Devlin
 Gene F. Dibise
 David G. Dickover
 Peter Diffley
 David L. Dillon
 Robert L. Dinkelspiel
 Hugh N. Dinwiddie, Jr.
 Thomas F. Divine
 Michael G. Doares
 James W. Dormer
 Dennis E. Dorratcague
 Anthony O. Doty
 Anthony W. Dougherty
 Richard Drew II
 Warren J. Drewes
 Thomas M. Droke
 Eugene R. Drum
 Bruce B. Dube
 Charles P. Duecy
 Robert F. Duminiak
 Andrew J. Dunar
 Christopher A. Dunn
 Harlan M. Durgin
 Ronald J. Dusa
 Dennis E. Dwyer
 Dennis V. Dyckman
 Raymond W. Dyer
 Richard H. East
 Jon A. Eastman
 James R. Edwards
 Robert A. Edwards
 Philip L. Eislerloh
 John F. Eisold
 William L. Eldred
 Ross T. Elliott
 Jon R. Elmendorf
 Donald C. Elmore
 Robert "G" Elston II
 Gerald A. Emison
 Robert J. Enders
 George H. Engstrom
 Robert A. Engstrom
 Thomas H. Enright
 Edward L. Erickson
 Richard C. Erickson
 John D. Eskew
 Charles L. Evans III
 James R. Evans
 John O. Evans, Jr.
 Steven R. Evans
 Robert E. Every
 Benjamin J. Ewers, Jr.
 Malcolm I. Fages
 John F. Farina
 Robert E. Faussner
 Michael L. Fedie
 Robert J. Fedoryszyn
 William S. Fellner
 John W. Fenton

William Fernandez II
 John P. Ferranti, Jr.
 Gregory P. Fetter
 Larry R. Fetterly
 Dennis J. Flaherty
 James T. Flaherty
 Michael B. Flaherty
 Mark E. Flandreau
 Michael D. Fowler
 Robert E. Fox
 Brian A. Foye
 Ronald J. Frederick
 Douglas J. Freeswick
 Hugh M. Flick
 Charles E. Fontanier
 William J. Fullar
 John W. Freed
 Paul E. Freudenthal
 Edward F. Frey
 Robert M. Fry
 Daniel W. Fuller
 Steven B. Gabriel
 Gary W. Gaines
 Kevin P. Gallen
 George B. Geer
 Clayton R. Gelfuss
 Carl D. Gent
 Robert T. George
 Richard J. Gibbens
 Dennis K. Gibbs
 George R. Gilbert
 Walter A. Gilmore
 Robert G. Glisch
 John S. Gladics
 Gary W. Glass
 Stephen W. Glidden
 William C. Glover, Jr.
 Eric R. Goepfert
 Ira E. Goldberg
 James L. Good
 Lyman C. Gordon, Jr.
 Charles T. Gowen
 Charles E. Grabill, Jr.
 Craig A. Gray
 James W. Greer, Jr.
 David B. Grimm, Jr.
 William F. Grimm
 William G. Groepper
 Christian R. Gross
 Christopher J. Guild
 Thomas E. Gunn
 James W. Gunter, Jr.
 Harry L. Gustafson
 Steven L. Guthier
 Paul D. Guthrie
 Felix S. Gygg
 Edward F. Hagan
 Alan L. Hagglund
 Bruce T. Haglund
 Kenneth W. Hall
 Robert C. Hall
 John C. Hamer
 Reed D. Hamilton, Jr.
 Charles R. Hamm II
 Eddie W. Hampshire
 Edward F. Hand, Jr.
 Irvin W. Hanks III
 John P. Hanlin
 James J. Hannigan
 Robert P. Hardesty
 Robert M. Hardy, Jr.
 George C. Harkness
 David J. Harr
 Joe N. Harris
 Howard T. Harris, Jr.
 James P. Harris
 James P. Harty
 Michael C. Harvell
 Charles T. Hast
 Mark A. Haverland
 John M. Hayes
 Perry B. Haynsworth, Jr.
 Stephen J. Healy
 Harry R. Hebblewhite
 Ralph R. Heffernan
 Charles C. Heil, Jr.
 David A. Heller

John L. Helm
 Joseph K. Henderson
 Brian D. Hennagin
 Ernest H. Henninger
 Howard P. Herbst
 Robert A. Herrington III
 Donald D. Herzberg
 William L. Hester, Jr.
 William A. Hickman
 James F. Higgins, Jr.
 Philip C. Hildebrandt
 Carl C. Hill III
 John R. Hillard
 James B. Hinkle
 David A. Hinman
 Christopher W. Hoback
 Hugh M. K. Hochberg
 Eric S. Hodson
 Gary R. Hoffman
 Herbert S. Hoffman III
 Daryl T. Holland
 Bernard G. Hollenbeck, Jr.
 Thomas B. Holliday
 Edward F. M. Hood
 Howard L. Hosp
 Andrew J. Hotelling
 Roger J. Howland
 John E. Hryharrow
 Elbert W. Huber, Jr.
 Ambrose W. Hudgens, Jr.
 Frank W. Hudson, Jr.
 Karl R. Hufnagel
 John D. Hughes
 John F. Hughes
 Delmas R. Hughey
 Roger K. Hull
 James A. Humphreys III
 John O. Hunnicutt III
 James S. Hunter
 John R. Hutson II
 Jerome J. Ingerski
 Lance M. Inouye
 Gary K. Iversen
 Kenneth J. Iverson
 Ronald D. Izatt
 Charles A. Jackson, Jr.
 William H. Jackson, Jr.
 David E. Jahr
 John H. Jakob
 Bruce E. James
 Jordan R. Janak
 Bernard Janov
 Eben K. Jenkins
 Robert K. Johann
 Charles A. Johannesmeyer
 Delmont S. Johnson
 Arthur L. Johnson
 Paul F. Johnson
 Robert S. Johnson
 William B. Jonasson, Jr.
 Phillip A. Jonik
 Patrick J. Kallal
 Henry J. Kaimus, Jr.
 William J. Kambic
 Michael J. Kamin
 Lothar F. Kamp
 Walter F. Keane, Jr.
 John M. Keenum
 Phillip A. Keith
 Michael W. Kelly
 Thomas A. Kelly
 David B. Kelsey
 John F. Kennedy
 John J. Kennedy, Jr.
 David Kennickell
 Steven D. Kesselring
 Rodger P. Kester
 John P. Ketz
 Walter Kiechel III
 David A. Kikel
 Thomas R. Kincaid
 Earl K. Kishida
 George M. Kissinger
 Bruce B. Knutson, Jr.
 Richard E. Koehler

James P. Kovalick
 Michael A. Kowalczyk
 John S. Kraabel
 William F. Kracke
 Thomas R. Kuhn
 William C. Kummert
 Robert E. Lakari
 Roger A. Lake
 Jay R. Lamarche
 John P. Lambert
 Philip C. Landon
 Robert B. Laney
 Paul J. Langford
 Lewis W. Lankford
 Thomas A. Larsen
 Vernon J. Larson
 James L. Larue
 Robert J. Lawson, Jr.
 Robert E. Lawton
 Gary R. Lea
 *Stephen C. Leaver
 Paul W. Leblanc
 Douglas E. Lee
 William L. Leinster
 Daniel J. Lekander
 Michael P. Lennon
 Joseph B. Lesesne
 Kenneth B. Levan
 Albert M. Lewis
 Michael N. Lewis
 Gilbert B. Libby, Jr.
 Jay E. Lieberman
 Dale R. Lilly
 Theodore M. Lindner
 Paul W. Lindoerfer
 Paul A. Linton
 Keith W. Lippert
 Joel J. Loeffler
 Jonathan J. Lohnes
 David C. Long
 Kirk A. Long
 Philip R. Long
 Frederick C. Louder, Jr.
 David A. Lovejoy
 Matthew H. Luca
 Carl I. Lundquist
 Robert F. Lynch
 Stephen P. Lyons
 Richard A. McAduo
 Edward C. McAllister
 Vincent J. McCarthy
 Michael C. McConnell
 John N. McConnell
 Michael T. McCormick
 Donald G. McDermott
 Edward C. McDonough
 Amos A. McGee, Jr.
 Douglas S. McGlashan
 Clifton L. McGlothlin
 Harry G. McConnell
 Dennis C. McCormick
 William C. McElroy, Jr.
 James P. McGrath
 Thomas J. McGrath
 Alexander B. McGregor
 Allen G. McKenzie
 William T. McLaughlin
 William R. McLellan
 Bruce K. McMurray
 Donald C. McNeil
 Gordon K. Maben
 Ross M. Macaskill, Jr.
 Bruce D. MacCoy
 John N. Maciejewski, Jr.
 Thomas F. Madden
 William T. Magee III
 David J. Magyar
 David J. Mallon, Jr.
 John M. Malone
 Dennis L. Mandsager
 Albert M. Mangin
 Edward F. Mann, Jr.
 Michael C. Mannshardt
 John F. Marra
 Walter D. Marschner
 Peter W. Marshall

Frederick K. Martin
 Kurt S. Martin
 Richard L. Martin
 Wiley R. Martin, Jr.
 Charles L. Martinson
 David K. Matthes
 Charles J. Mauck III
 Richard W. Mayo
 Martin C. Meade
 Leonard E. Meads
 Paul N. Medford
 Alvin R. Merriam
 Frederick S. Messick, Jr.
 Stephen Metcalf
 Joe D. Metzger
 James R. Meyer
 Don R. Michael
 Oswald L. Mikell
 Charles J. Mikulis, Jr.
 Grady W. Miller III
 James J. Miller
 John D. Miller, Jr.
 Patrick A. Miller
 Randall C. Miller
 William C. Miller
 David A. Milne
 George F. Milne
 Dennis S. Minno
 James M. Mieziva
 Donald C. Moak
 James F. Moffett III
 William P. Moir
 John B. Montgomery
 Andrew C. Montz
 Frederick C. Moore
 Frederick J. Moore
 Richard A. Moore
 Christopher C. Morell
 Paul L. Morell
 Vincent S. Morgan
 Charles R. Morris III
 David T. Morrison
 Michael J. Morrissey
 Francis X. Morse
 Theodore G. Morrison
 Richard P. Moseley
 David K. Moussette
 Hugh R. Muir
 Jeffrey R. Muise
 James J. Mulva
 Edward F. J. Murach
 Robert J. Murphy, Jr.
 William J. Myers
 James A. Myles
 Stephen P. Nathan
 Charles C. Neal
 John G. Neeb
 David W. Nelson
 Irwin H. Nelson
 Richard E. Nelson
 John W. Nemeth
 James E. Nestell, Jr.
 William L. Nettelhorst
 James H. Nicholson
 Jeremy J. Nittle
 William J. Noffsinger
 Thomas F. Nolan IV
 Richard F. Noll
 Robert G. Nordmann
 John B. Norton
 John T. Nugent
 Robert W. Nutter
 William L. Nyland
 Marvin D. Oberman
 Robert G. O'Brien
 John D. O'Connor
 Edward J. Odachowski, Jr.
 Steven J. Oder
 Michael D. Ohanlon
 Thomas G. Olsen
 Jerome A. Olson
 Harry F. O'Neill, Jr.
 Donald J. Opeka
 James G. Osborn
 John D. Overhouse
 Edward P. Owens
 Bryant G. Pake
 Raymond J. Palmer
 David H. Pankow
 Merlin L. Parde

Bruce Parizek
 Anthony W. Parker
 Jimmy W. Parker
 Urey W. Patrick III
 William J. Patton
 Richard E. Payne
 David G. Payte
 Elly B. Pearlman
 John K. Pearson
 Ronald S. Pearson
 John W. Peirce
 Allen L. Perkins II
 Michael E. Perrault
 Keith M. Perry
 Robert R. Petering
 Gary L. Petersen
 Philip A. Peterson
 Roger A. Pfahl
 Jonathan C. Picciuolo
 Jeffrey R. Pier
 David C. Pierman
 Ignatius M. Plotrowiak
 Martin E. Plante
 Kenneth T. Plesser
 James S. Polk
 John E. Pool
 Raymond P. Potwora
 Kenneth W. Prater
 Ralph W. Preston
 Ronald T. Pretulak
 John E. Priebe
 James D. Purvis
 Frank W. Putnam
 Michael T. Rabb
 Daniel S. Ramelli III
 Thomas R. Rampe
 John H. Rankin
 Alfred A. Rasmus
 Christopher L. Rasmussen
 John N. Raudabaugh
 James B. Ray, Jr.
 James U. Ray
 Gerald E. Raynes
 Edward F. Rebennack
 Judd H. Redfield III
 James R. Reed
 Robert B. Reed, Jr.
 Kevin J. Regan
 William K. Reid
 Donald R. Rentschler
 Robert S. Rhodes
 Nicholas R. Ribaud
 John D. Rickards
 Hans E. Rider
 Donald L. Riffle
 John N. Ringsby
 John G. Rinker
 Paul C. Rizzi, Jr.
 David M. Roberts
 Richard N. Roberts
 Gerald O. Robichaud
 Robert A. Robinson
 William O. Rogers
 David F. Rogus
 Charles F. Rolf
 Wayne D. Romberg
 William A. Roper, Jr.
 Carl W. Rosengrant
 David B. Ross
 Jeffrey A. Roux
 Frederick G. Ruben
 Daniel J. Rumpf
 James M. Runsold
 Edwin A. Ruotsinofa
 Robert E. Russell
 Timothy C. Rutledge
 Douglas Ryan
 James A. Ryan
 Mark J. Ryan
 Michael C. Ryan
 Svend A. Ryge
 James R. Ryland III
 Donald H. Ryujin
 Patrick A. Sandoz
 Nelson J. Sanesi, Jr.
 Kenneth M. Santoro
 Hugh F. Saracino
 Alex J. Sater III
 Robert B. Satterford, Jr.
 John C. Savo

Patrick H. Saxon
John C. Scales, Jr.
Lowell T. Schaefer
Paul A. Schaeffer
Donald A. Schallack
Brian P. Schanning
Robert P. Schauss, Jr.
Lawrence S. Schein
John A. Schiltz
William B. Schmidt
*Richard F. Schneider
James S. Schnieders, Jr.
Martin G. Schoonderwoerd
Mathias C. Schramer III
William H. Schriever
Richard W. Schrum
Robert E. Schunter
Peter A. Schutter
*Andrew J. Schwarz
Richard F. Scott
Richard A. Searles
Marlin D. Seiders, Jr.
Frank B. Sewall
Robert J. Shade
Paul B. Shaffer
Randolph G. Shaner
Jeffrey C. Shaw
James T. Sheddian, Jr.
Robert M. Shepherd, Jr.
Arthur E. Sherman
Gary H. Shirk
Edwin R. Shirley
James R. Shorter, Jr.
John W. Shultz III
Robert W. Siefker
Michael E. Simpson
George W. Sine, Jr.
Leroy E. Sitlinger, Jr.
Douglas M. Sjoberg
Daniel S. Skaluba
James M. Small
Daniel E. Smith
David E. Smith
Dirk M. Smith
Edward A. Smith, Jr.
John H. Smith
Kenneth B. Smith
Stephen R. Smith
Steven G. Smith
George M. Smonko
John R. Snyder
Thomas D. Sosaygalaher
David M. Southworth
Clark S. Spalsbury, Jr.
Jerry R. Sparger
William C. Sparrow, Jr.
William G. Speed, Jr.
Barton M. Spencer
Robert B. Spinelli
Robert L. Squires
Joseph C. Stack, Jr.
Charles A. Staebler III
Fred T. Stapp, Jr.
Wayne P. Starke
*Peter Steitz
Robert G. Stender
John T. Stoeke
Richard L. Stow
Michael W. Stradley
Ronald L. Straight
William J. Straub III
James M. Straughn
Wayne L. Strausbaugh
Joseph R. Sturgis
Paul J. Sucato
Jerry E. Sullivan
Timothy T. Sullivan
Bruce E. Sulzner
Carl F. Susong
James F. Sutter
Douglas W. Swanson
Peter A. Tangren
Stephen A. Tanner

Allen G. Taylor, Jr.
Charles F. Taylor, Jr.
Jimmy B. Taylor
John D. Taylor
Paul J. Taylor
James L. Thomas
Edward E. Thompson
George R. Tiedeman
Stuart P. Timm
Thomas F. Timmons
Steven E. Titunik
William L. Todd
Michael M. Torbert
David M. Trousdale
David L. Troutman
Steven A. Trulson
*Gerald D. Tucker
Arthur L. Twombly
Robert G. Tyrrell
Allen E. Uchman
David E. Upchurch
William D. Vail
James M. Valkevich
Claude Valles
Michael J. Vandamm
David Vansau
William H. Vanstone, Jr.
Verney V. Vehlwald
John C. Velotta
Craig D. Venator
Jerome B. Vieau
Raymond D. Vining
James W. Vinson, Jr.
Richard G. Vollaro
Gilbert H. Vorhoff, Jr.
Taylor B. Wagenseil
Jon B. Wales
Joseph D. Walsh
Donald E. Wamberg, Jr.
Kenneth J. Ward
Robert S. Warner, Jr.
Bradford B. Waterman III
David M. Watkinson
David S. Watson
James R. Watt
Charles L. Weber, Jr.
Douglas E. Weber
Steven B. Weeks
John M. Weigle
Lee K. Welch
Albert L. Wellman III
John S. Welsh
John G. West
*Charles S. Westman
Jeffrey P. Wetzel
Max T. Weyrick
Stephen A. Wexler
Jan M. Whitacre
John H. Whitehouse, Jr.
Victor P. Wickman
Douglas P. Wilta
Frank B. Williams III
Jay K. B. Williams
William R. Williams
Thomas D. Willson
George D. Wilson
Jack A. Wilson
John W. Wilson III
William P. Willund
Gary P. Witte
David P. Wollaeger
Gilbert L. Wolverton
George G. Woodward, Jr.
Richard C. Woodward
Millard J. Wooley
Charles A. Worley
William W. Wright
Larry P. Yarham
James A. Young
Grant H. Youngman
John D. Yoxthelmer
William L. Yuen
Richard R. Zahner
Fort A. Zackary, Jr.
Robert W. Zeller III
Gene G. Zettle

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Donald L. Atchison
William G. Blenkley
Fred "H" Bradley, Jr.
James L. Collins
Harold L. Cox, Jr.
Howard L. Crego
Henry L. Davis
James L. Dodd
Charles E. Ellis
Howard D. Ellis
George P. Faulkner, Jr.
David J. Funke
Cain Garrett, Jr.
Hugh F. Glynn
Albert L. Goldfinch
William W. Grannis
Robert E. Gump
James R. Harvey
Thomas J. Hassell
Glenn W. Herrick
John B. Herrick
William F. Hill
Joseph P. Higgins, Jr., (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and a temporary lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

James T. Clynes.
Charles M. Davis, Jr.
Ralph E. Schnee (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John A. Balikowski
Robert S. Baycar
John C. Neal, Jr.
Charles R. Nicklin
James W. Nickerson, Jr.
William H. Petri III
*George R. Ross
Noel C. Wilson, Jr.
Kenneth A. White

Dewey W. Peace, Jr., (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant commander and a temporary commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert J. Bailey
Michael A. Harris
Robert P. Majors, Jr.
Allen J. Stone

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John W. Edwards
James F. Ervin II
Larry J. Hall
Alexander L. Kesselman

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Edsel J. Aucoin
John D. Bell
William A. Binder
William B. Branson
Wilfred J. Brownlow, Jr.
Robert G. Case
Paul E. Cianci
Joe C. Cole
Cornelius J. Cornell
Jack L. Crain
Dewey B. Cramer
Sebastian F. Dovi, Jr.
Oscar E. Edwards

John J. Etnoyer
Earl F. Evans, Jr.
Raymond L. Farrell
Richard E. Freeman
Jack T. Fulmer
Dwight G. Geha
Robert L. Giuntoli
Ashton L. Graybiel, Jr.
Ronald E. Hubbard
James P. Hughes
Charles H. Hutchins
Clifford J. Kamen, Jr.
William A. King, Jr.
Carlton J. Kom
Robert M. Lambert
Geoffrey A. Larsen
Sylvio G. Landry, Jr.
Thomas J. Lapine
James J. Linville
Franklin X. Loeb
Ward T. McCraney, Jr.

George M. MacNabb, Jr.
Charles H. Michalko
Allen R. Myers
Thomas J. Muldowney
Robert D. Orr
John H. Payne III
John R. Piconi
Vance L. Polich
Morris W. Pulliam
Lawrence W. Raymond
George M. Ricketson III
Philip G. Rosene
Mario R. Schwabe
William C. Stone
John C. Sweeney
John P. Swope
Benjamin T. Taylor
James W. Thrasher
Robert M. Trent
Robert B. Wainright

*Paul J. Post, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a permanent lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code 1211.

The following-named temporary chief warrant officers to be appointed permanent chief warrant officers W-4, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Ralph K. Anderson.
*Phillip V. Fish.

The following-named temporary chief warrant officers to be appointed permanent chief warrant officers W-3, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

*Howard S. Combs.
*Wayman B. Rettig.
*Milton R. Yackle.

*George U. Forsen, temporary chief warrant officer to be appointed a permanent chief warrant officer W-4, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Burton M. Pierce, temporary chief warrant officer to be appointed a permanent chief warrant officer W-2 and a temporary chief warrant officer W-3, in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following named (platoon leaders class) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Allen, Franklin S., III
Allred, James C.
Ambort, Louis R.
Amos, James H., Jr.
Anderson, Dennis P.
Bailey, Robert L.
Banning, Deryll B.
Barber, Richard E.
Barnett, Charles J.
Barrett, Charles W.
Barry, John L.
Basham, Gary W.
Beaver, Donald D.
Beggs, Michael R.
Benesh, John R.
Benson, James R.
Benson, Martin J.
Bertleson, Ralph L.
Blackman, John F.
Bloom, Dean N.
Bowman, John J.
Broderick, Matthew E.
Brookshire, Homer W.
Cahill, Robert E.
Cain, Carl F., Jr.
Capito, John W.
Carlson, Curtis B.
Champeau, John B.
Chorpenning, Patrick F.
Clark, Curtis D.
Conover, Donald L.
Converse, George S.
Corbin, Jerry W.
Corn, Gary R.
Courtney, Wayne L.
Cutsinger, Shannon A.
Dalton, Michael T.
Daly, John H., III
Davis, Jack A.
Decoteau, Samuel C.
Detch, James A.
Dineen, Timothy G.
Dixon, Dennis M.
Dorfman, Paul A.
Drahn, Richard D.
Eisiminger, Milton J.
Evans, Gordon E.
Faulk, Raymond E.
Fears, Oscar B., Jr.
Feldt, John E.
Fenton, John R.
Fraser, John F.
Gagnon, Robert J.
Garner, Charles K.

Gest, Joseph S.
 Gilley, Kenneth D.
 Gilbert, Glen G.
 Goss, David E.
 Goza, Joel L.
 Green, William W.
 Griffin, Frank H., III
 Hagstrom, Clarence E.
 Jr.
 Hamilton, Robert E.
 Harkins, Thomas G.
 Hartnady, James P., Jr.
 Haskett, Robert C.
 Heinzelman, Charles W.
 Henes, Clifford C., II
 Hensley, Robert W.
 Henthorne, Norris G., III
 Hering, John C.
 Hinton, Allyn J., Jr.
 Hire, Michael G.
 Hopwood, Thomas J.
 Howes, Paul A.
 Hugenberg, Paul B., Jr.
 Ingram, David H.
 Irwin, Thomas H. H.
 Jacobs, David H.

Jankiewicz, Barry E.
 Jeranek, Robert W.
 Johnson, Maxwell O.
 Johnson, Robert W., Jr.
 Kelly, John R.
 Kinsell, Thomas W.
 Kocevar, Frank L.
 Kranz, Dwight D., Jr.
 Lahlum, Philip A.
 Larkin, Roy A.
 Leet, David L.
 Lenz, Randolph W.
 Liljenquist, Blaine L.
 Little, Thomas E., Jr.
 Lockwood, Carl J.
 Loughlin, Thomas E.
 Mack, John M.
 Mack, Robert J.
 Martin, Stephen M.
 Mason, Richard L.
 Masterson, Rodney G.
 McCarty, Michael R.
 McCoy, Charles P.
 McDonald, Ian F.
 McKeithen, Michael B.
 McLane, Richard E., II
 McLaughlin,
 Michael J., Jr.
 McNerney, Jon M.

Merritt, James F., III
 Mitchell, Joseph A., Jr.
 Mitchell, Robert B.
 Nunan, Timothy P.
 Orth, Thomas M.
 Owen, Jerry D.
 Owens, Mackubin T.
 Paul, James J.
 Peters, Don P., III
 Peters, William G.
 Peterson, Harry W., III
 Pittman, James G.
 Porisch, Karl J.
 Porrello, Richard D.
 Porter, Joseph E., III
 Priestler, Frederick C.
 Prosser, Lloyd H.
 Fyle, Wilton S.
 Rabold, Raymond C.
 Raee, Raymond C.
 Rainey, Gary D.
 Rigby, Jesse W.
 Rodatz, Christian A.
 Rollings, Wayne E.
 Ronald, Jeffrey T.
 Ross, Ronald D.
 Sample, Martin D.
 Shinn, Robert A.
 Silva, Herbert P.

Simon, David S.
 Smalligan, Paul T.
 Solhan, George
 Stanislaw, Louis J.
 Steinhuller, John E.
 Stevens, Arnold T., Jr.
 Stiehl, James H.
 Storm, Dennis M.
 Stough, Gary E.
 Struble, John M.
 Terlecki, James E.
 Todd, Gary G.
 Towers, Donigan D.
 Trammell, Thomas B., Jr.
 Trapnell, Byron N.
 Tretsch, Robert A., Jr.
 Tucker, William T.
 Turner, Thomas D.
 Vanhuss, Earnest A.
 Voll, Richard B.
 Waimey, Stephen T.
 Whittington, William R.
 Widdison, Alan K.
 Wilkinson, Donald E.
 Williamson, Rickey D.
 Wood, Walter J.
 Woodard, Claude V.

The following named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Bensley, Albert M. | Hughes, Edwin D. |
| Bumm, Marcus J. | Lakin, John H. |
| Dean, Charles G., Jr. | Maloney, David P. |
| Flood, Michael L. | Maxfield, Keith L. |
| Goodrich, Robert B. | Potten, Milton E., Jr. |
| Graff, John P. | Randel, Kerry O. |
| Hayes, Thomas W. | Silvoso, Joseph A. |
| Hedin, Richard A. | Whitaker, Robert L. |
| Hucks, Robert P. | |

The following named (U.S. Air Force Academy Graduate) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Ewers, Richard G.

The following named (staff noncommissioned officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

| | |
|--------------------|------------------------|
| Blum, William F. | Jones, Delver J. |
| Bolton, Gilbert H. | Warrington, Francis P. |

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Champion Steer Given to Junior Village Youngsters

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 18, 1968

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the opportunity to visit the Department of Agriculture at the invitation of Secretary Orville L. Freeman to congratulate young Randy Helms, of Holbrook, Nebr., the owner of the grand champion steer at the National Western Stock Show.

My interest in young Helms and his prize steer, "Big Red," stems from the fact that the fine animal was purchased by the Denver Hilton Hotel, which is located in my congressional district, for the sum of \$10,867.50—or \$10.35 per pound.

The Denver Hilton Hotel turned Big Red over to Secretary Freeman and he donated the animal to the children of Junior Village here in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I include a news release relating to the presentation ceremony on Wednesday, March 13, and Secretary Freeman's remarks on that occasion in the RECORD at this point:

WESTERN GRAND CHAMPION STEER TO BE PRESENTED TO JUNIOR VILLAGE YOUNGSTERS

WASHINGTON, March 11, 1968.—Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman will officiate at a ceremony on Wednesday, March 13, at 10:30 a.m., during which Big Red, top prize winning steer of the National Western Stock Show, will be presented to the children of Junior Village.

District of Columbia Mayor Walter E. Washington will accept the grand champion steer at the presentation to take place in the Patio of the U.S. Department of Agriculture

Administration Building, 13th Street and Jefferson Drive, S.W. Big Red was purchased for the highest price paid for a steer at the annual National Western Stock Show held in Denver, Colo., last January.

Randy Helms of Holbrook, Nebraska, who raised the prize beef, received \$10.35 a pound from the Denver Hilton Hotel for the 1,050 pound animal.

Twenty months ago the 17-year-old Randy purchased Big Red, a one-day-old calf, for \$46.

After buying the steer, the Denver Hilton turned it over to Secretary Freeman for an appropriate use. The Secretary decided to give it to the children of Junior Village.

Nash Castro, director of the National Capital Region of the National Park Service, will take custody of the steer from Mayor Washington. The steer will be kept at the Oxon Hill Children's Farm, operated by the National Park Service of the U.S. Department of the Interior. This will permit the Junior Village youngsters to visit their champion. It also will give other urban children a chance to see a fine farm animal.

Randy, who will accompany Big Red to Washington, D.C. for the ceremony, is a member of the 4-H Club and Future Farmers of America (FFA). He recently received a check for \$1,000 from the American Polled Hereford Association for his accomplishment in raising Big Red.

Randy is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Helms of Holbrook. He entered Big Red in the Nebraska State Fair at Lincoln last September and the Grasslands Livestock Show in North Platte, Nebraska, last October. The steer took first place in its class in each show. Then he went on to the National Western Stock Show.

TEXT OF SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FREEMAN'S REMARKS AT "BIG RED" CEREMONY, WASHINGTON, MARCH 13, 1968

We are here today to celebrate one of the many, many things that are right with America.

We are here to celebrate a Cinderella story—the kind of story we love, because we know that here in America it still can, and does, come true.

The story begins about 21 months ago, on June 17, 1966. A boy and his dad went to a livestock auction and there a day-old, white-faced, polled Hereford calf caught the boy's eye.

Whether he had a hunch or whether he just thought the calf was cute, young Randy Helms yielded to an impulse.

He bought that calf—for \$46.00—and he took it home to nurse on a milk cow.

With remarkable foresight, Randy called his calf "Big Red."

Today Randy's cute calf is "Big Red" in fact as well as in name—1,050 pounds of modern-type beef animal with, in words of the judges, "plenty of stretch and smoothness without excessive wasty fat."

Last Fall Randy had no idea of "Big Red's" lineage. He just knew "Big Red" was out of the ordinary.

So he entered him in the Nebraska State Fair at Lincoln last September—and he won.

Then he entered him in the Grasslands Livestock Show in North Platte, Nebraska, last October—and he won.

He entered him in the National Western Stock Show in Denver in January—where he came up against 397 other steers in the Hereford Division of the Junior Show—and he won.

Then "Big Red" faced the winners of the Junior Show's Angus and Shorthorn champions—and still he won.

Finally, he stood up against the toughest competition of all, the breed champions in the open steer class, representing the best of 318 open class entries—and again he won.

"Big Red" is Grand Champion Steer of the 1968 National Western Stock Show.

Remember, I said, that Randy bought him for \$46.00. He sold him to the Denver Hilton Hotel for a record \$10.35 a pound—or a total of \$10,867.50. All told, including a check from the American Polled Hereford Association and his premiums for winning in other classes, "Big Red's" earnings are just short of \$12,000.

I cite these details because they add up to a classic example of the American dream—building an inauspicious beginning into a great success, a pittance into a comparative fortune, climbing out of nowhere to the top.